

ON THE STRUCTURE OF THE SPREADING MODELS OF A BANACH SPACE

G. ANDROULAKIS, E. ODELL, TH. SCHLUMPRECHT, N. TOMCZAK-JAEGERMANN

Abstract We study some questions concerning the structure of the set of spreading models of a separable infinite-dimensional Banach space X . In particular we give an example of a reflexive X so that all spreading models of X contain ℓ_1 but none of them is isomorphic to ℓ_1 . We also prove that for any countable set C of spreading models generated by weakly null sequences there is a spreading model generated by a weakly null sequence which dominates each element of C . In certain cases this ensures that X admits, for each $\alpha < \omega_1$, a spreading model $(\tilde{x}_i^\alpha)_i$ such that if $\alpha < \beta$ then $(\tilde{x}_i^\alpha)_i$ is dominated by (and not equivalent to) $(\tilde{x}_i^\beta)_i$. Some applications of these ideas are used to give sufficient conditions on a Banach space for the existence of a subspace and an operator defined on the subspace, which is not a compact perturbation of a multiple of the inclusion map.

1. INTRODUCTION

It is known that for every normalized basic sequence (y_i) in a Banach space and for every $\varepsilon_n \searrow 0$ there exists a subsequence (x_i) and a normalized basic sequence $(\tilde{x}_i)$ such that: For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $(a_i)_{i=1}^n \in [-1, 1]^n$ and $n \leq k_1 < \dots < k_n$

$$(1) \quad \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_{k_i} \right\| - \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \tilde{x}_i \right\| < \varepsilon_n.$$

The sequence $(\tilde{x}_i)$ is called the *spreading model* of (x_i) and it is a suppression-1 unconditional basic sequence if (y_i) is weakly null (see [8] and [9]; see also [7](I.3.Proposition 2) and [26] for more about spreading models). This in conjunction with Rosenthal's ℓ_1 theorem [30], yields that every separable infinite dimensional Banach space X admits a suppression 1-unconditional spreading model $(\tilde{x}_i)$. In fact one can always find a 1-unconditional spreading model [31]. It is natural to ask if one can always say more. What types of spreading models must always exist? Sometimes we refer to $\tilde{X} = [\tilde{x}_i : i \in \mathbb{N}]$, the closed linear span of $(\tilde{x}_i)$, as the spreading model of (x_i) . By James' well known theorem [18] every such X thus admits a spreading model $\tilde{X}$ which is either reflexive or contains an isomorph of c_0 or ℓ_1 . It was once speculated that for all such X some spreading model $(\tilde{x}_i)$ must be equivalent to the unit vector basis of c_0 or ℓ_p for some $1 \leq p < \infty$ but this was proved to be false [27]. A replacement conjecture was brought to our attention by V.D. Milman: must every separable space X admit a spreading model which is either isomorphic to c_0 or ℓ_1 or is reflexive? In section 2 we show this to be false by constructing a space X so that for all spreading models $\tilde{X}$ of X , $\tilde{X}$ contains ℓ_1 but $\tilde{X}$ is never isomorphic to ℓ_1 . The example borrows some of the intuition behind the example of [27]. That space had the property that amongst the ℓ_p and

This research was supported by NSF, NSERC and the Pacific Institute for the Mathematical Sciences. In addition, the fourth author holds the Canada Research Chair in Mathematics.

c_0 spaces only ℓ_1 could be block finitely representable in any spreading model $(\tilde{x}_i)$ yet no spreading model could contain ℓ_1 .

The motivation behind our example comes from the “Schreierized” version $S(d_{w,1})$ of the Lorentz space $d_{w,1}$. Let $1 = w_1 > w_2 > \dots$ with $w_n \rightarrow 0$ and $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} w_n = \infty$. Then $d_{w,1}$ is the sequence space whose norm is given by

$$\|x\| = \sum_n w_n x_n^*$$

where x is the sequence (x_n) and (x_n^*) is the decreasing rearrangement of $(|x_n|)$. One could then define the sequence space $S(d_{w,1})$ as the completion of c_{00} (the linear span of finitely supported sequences of reals) under

$$\|x\| = \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}, n \leq k_1 < k_2 < \dots < k_n} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i x_{k_i}^*.$$

In this case the unit vector basis (e_i) has a spreading model, namely the unit vector basis of $d_{w,1}$, which is not an ℓ_1 basis but whose span is hereditarily ℓ_1 . $S(d_{w,1})$ is hereditarily c_0 so it does not solve Milman’s question. In order to avoid c_0 one may also define the “Tsirelsonized” version $T(d_{w,1})$ of $d_{w,1}$. $T(d_{w,1})$ is the completion of c_{00} under the implicit equation

$$\|x\| = \max \left(\|x\|_{\infty}, \sup \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \|E_i x\|^* \right)$$

where the supremum is taken over all integers n , and all *admissible* sets $(E_i)_{i=1}^n$ i.e. $n \leq E_1 < \dots < E_n$ (this means $n \leq \min E_1 \leq \max E_1 < \min E_2 \leq \dots$). $E_i x$ is the restriction of x to the set E_i . It may well be that $T(d_{w,1})$ has the properties we desire but we were unable to show this. Thus we were forced to “layer” the norm in a certain sense (see section 2 below).

In Section 3 we consider in a wider context $SP_{\omega}(X)$, the partially ordered set of all spreading models $(\tilde{x}_i)$ generated by weakly null sequences in X . The partial order is defined by domination: we write $(\tilde{x}_i) \geq (\tilde{y}_i)$ if for some $C < \infty$ we have $C \|\sum a_i \tilde{x}_i\| \geq \|\sum a_i \tilde{y}_i\|$ for all scalars (a_i) . We identify $(\tilde{x}_i)$ and $(\tilde{y}_i)$ in $SP_{\omega}(X)$ if $(\tilde{x}_i) \geq (\tilde{y}_i) \geq (\tilde{x}_i)$. We prove (in Proposition 3.2) that if $C \subseteq SP_{\omega}(X)$ is countable then there exists $(\tilde{x}_i) \in SP_{\omega}(X)$ which dominates all members of C . This enables us to prove that in certain cases one can produce an uncountable chain $\{(\tilde{x}_i^{\alpha})_i\}_{\alpha < \omega_1}$ with $(\tilde{x}_i^{\alpha})_i < (\tilde{x}_i^{\beta})_i$ if $\alpha < \beta < \omega_1$. The example of the previous section and the above yield a solution to a uniformity question raised by H. Rosenthal. The question (and a dual version) are as follows: Let a separable Banach space Z have the property that for all spreading models $(\tilde{x}_i)$ of normalized basic sequences

$$\lim_n \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{x}_i \right\| / n = 0 \quad \left(\text{respectively, } \lim_n \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{x}_i \right\| = \infty \right).$$

Does there exist (λ_n) with $\lim_n \lambda_n / n = 0$ (respectively $\lim_n \lambda_n = \infty$) such that for all spreading models $(\tilde{x}_i)$ of normalized basic sequences in Z

$$\lim_n \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{x}_i \right\| / \lambda_n = 0 \quad \left(\text{respectively, } \lim_n \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{x}_i \right\| / \lambda_n = \infty \right)?$$

We give negative answers to these questions. The example that solves the first question is the space X of section 2. Moreover every subspace of X fails to admit such a sequence (λ_n) . We do not know of a hereditary solution to the second question.

In section 4 we consider the problem: if $|SP_\omega(X)| = 1$, i.e., if X has a unique spreading model up to equivalence, must this spreading model be equivalent to the unit vector basis in c_0 or ℓ_p for some $1 \leq p < \infty$? The question was asked of us by S. A. Argyros. It is easy to see that the answer is positive if the spreading models are uniformly isomorphic. We show that the answer is positive if 1 belongs to the “Krivine set” of some spreading model.

Definition 1.1. *Let (x_i) be a 1-subsymmetric basic sequence. The Krivine set of (x_i) is the set of p 's ($1 \leq p \leq \infty$) with the following property: For all $\varepsilon > 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(\lambda_k)_{k=1}^m \subset \mathbb{R}$, such that for all $(a_i)_1^n \subseteq \mathbb{R}$,*

$$\frac{1}{1+\varepsilon} \|(a_i)_{i=1}^n\|_p \leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i y_i \right\| \leq (1+\varepsilon) \|(a_i)_{i=1}^n\|_p$$

where

$$y_i = \sum_{k=1}^m \lambda_k x_{(i-1)m+k} \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n$$

and $\|\cdot\|_p$ denotes the norm of the space ℓ_p .

The proof of Krivine's theorem [21] as modified by Lemberg [22]) (see also [15], remark II.5.14 and [24]), shows that for every 1-subsymmetric basic sequence (x_i) the Krivine set of (x_i) is non-empty. It is important to note that our definition of a Krivine p requires not merely that ℓ_p be block finitely representable in $[x_i]$ but each ℓ_p^n unit vector basis is obtainable by means of an identically distributed block basis.

An immediate consequence of the fact that the Krivine set of a spreading model is non-empty is the following:

Remark 1.2. *Assume that (x_i) is a seminormalized basic sequence in a Banach space X which has a spreading model $(\tilde{x}_i)$. We can assume that for some zero sequence (ε_i) (1) is satisfied. Then there is a $p \in [1, \infty]$ such that for all n and all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a finite sequence $(\lambda_i)_{i=1}^m \subset \mathbb{R}$ so that any block of (y_i) of (x_i) of the form*

$$y_i = \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j x_{n(i,j)}, \quad \text{with } n(1,1) < n(1,2) < \dots < n(1,m) < n(2,1) < \dots < n(2,m) < n(3,1) \dots$$

has a spreading model $(\tilde{y}_i)$ which is isometric to the sequence $(\sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j \tilde{x}_{(i-1)m+j})_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ and has the property that its first n elements are $(1+\varepsilon)$ -equivalent to the unit vector basis of ℓ_p^n . For $i_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough (or passing to an appropriate subsequence of (x_i)) we also observe that $(y_{k_j})_{j=1}^n$ is $(1+2\varepsilon)$ -equivalent to the ℓ_p^n unit basis whenever $i_0 < k_1 < \dots < k_n$.

In Section 5 we give sufficient conditions on a Banach space X for the existence of a subspace Y of X and an operator $T : Y \rightarrow X$ which is not a compact perturbation of the inclusion map. W.T. Gowers [15] proved that there exists a subspace Y of the Gowers-Maurey space GM (constructed in [16]) and there exists an operator $T : Y \rightarrow GM$ which is not a compact perturbation of the inclusion map. Here we extend the work of W.T. Gowers to a more general setting. For example suppose that X admits a spreading model $(\tilde{x}_i)$ which

is not equivalent to the unit vector basis in ℓ_1 but such that 1 is in the Krivine set of $(\tilde{x}_i)$. Then (Theorem 5.1) there exists a subspace W of X and a bounded operator $T : W \rightarrow W$ such that $p(T)$ is not a compact perturbation of the identity, for any polynomial p .

2. SPREADING MODELS CONTAINING ℓ_1 WHICH ARE NOT ℓ_1

Theorem 2.1. *There exists a reflexive Banach space X with an unconditional basis such that the spreading model of any normalized basic sequence in X is not isomorphic to c_0 or ℓ_1 and is not reflexive.*

For $x = (x_i)_i \in c_{00}$ we write $\text{supp } x = \{i : x_i \neq 0\}$. For $x, y \in c_{00}$ and an integer k we say that $x < y$ if $\max \text{supp } x < \min \text{supp } y$, and we write $k < x$ if $k < \min \text{supp } x$. (e_i) denotes the unit vector basis of c_{00} .

In order to prove Theorem 2.1 we will construct a space X which has certain properties as stated in the following result, which will easily imply Theorem 2.1.

Theorem 2.2. *There is a space X with the following properties:*

- a) (e_i) is a normalized 1-unconditional basis for X .
- b) For any normalized block basis of (e_i) having spreading model $(\tilde{x}_i)$ we have that $(\tilde{x}_i)$ is not equivalent to the unit vector basis of ℓ_1 .
- c) For any normalized block basic sequence in X having a spreading model $(\tilde{x}_i)$ we have that ℓ_1 embeds into $[(\tilde{x}_i)]$.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Let X be chosen as in Theorem 2.2. Since X has an unconditional basis and does not contain a subspace isomorphic to ℓ_1 or c_0 (otherwise a block basis of (e_i) would be equivalent to either the unit vector basis of ℓ_1 or c_0 , both of which are excluded by (b) and (c)), X must be reflexive.

Since X is reflexive every normalized basic sequence in X has a subsequence which is equivalent to a block basis of (e_i) . Therefore (b) and (c), and the fact that ℓ_1 has a unique subsymmetric basis, imply that all the spreading models of normalized basic sequences in X are neither reflexive nor isomorphic to c_0 or ℓ_1 . $\square$

Construction of the space X : First we choose an increasing sequence of integers (n_i) such that

$$(2) \quad \frac{1}{(n_1 + n_2 + \dots + n_k)^{1/p}} \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{n_i}{3^i} \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} \infty \quad \text{for all } p > 1.$$

In order to choose a sequence (n_i) satisfying (2), first choose a sequence $(p_k)_k$ with $p_k \searrow 1$ and then inductively on $k \in \mathbb{N}$ pick (n_k) to satisfy

$$\frac{1}{(n_1 + n_2 + \dots + n_k)^{1/p_k}} \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{n_i}{3^i} > k$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Now we choose a norm $\|\cdot\|$ on c_{00} to satisfy the following Tsirelson type equation (see [28]):

$$\|x\| = \|x\|_\infty \vee \sup_{\substack{k \in \mathbb{N}, i \leq k \\ k \leq E_1^i < E_2^i < \dots < E_{n_i}^i}} \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{3^i} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \|E_j^i x\|.$$

Note that we do not require that $E_j^s \cap E_{j'}^t = \emptyset$ if $s \neq t$. Henceforth in this section X will denote the completion of c_{00} under this norm. It is easy to see that the unit vector basis (e_i) is a normalized 1-unconditional basis for X . It will be useful to introduce the sequence of equivalent norms $\|\cdot\|_i$, for $i \in \mathbb{N}$, as follows:

$$\|x\|_i = \sup_{E_1 < E_2 < \dots < E_{n_i}} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \|E_j x\|.$$

Note that we have

$$\|x\| = \|x\|_\infty \vee \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{3^i} \|[k, \infty)x\|_i.$$

Proof of Theorem 2.2. a) is immediate.

b) We need the following auxiliary results. We postpone the proofs.

Lemma 2.3. *For any normalized block basis (y_i) of (e_i) and for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a subsequence (x_i) and $i_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and integers $k, j_1, \dots, j_N$ with $i_0 \leq k \leq j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_N$ we have that*

$$(3) \quad \sum_{i=i_0}^k \frac{1}{3^i} \left\| [k, \infty) \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{s=1}^N x_{j_s} \right) \right\|_i < \varepsilon.$$

Lemma 2.4. *Let (y_i) be a normalized block basis of (e_i) in X which has a spreading model $(\tilde{y}_i)$ and suppose that $N \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfies*

$$(4) \quad .99 \leq \left\| \frac{1}{2N} (\tilde{y}_1 + \dots + \tilde{y}_{2N}) \right\|.$$

Then there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and a subsequence (x_i) of (y_i) such that for all $j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_N$,

$$(5) \quad .96 < \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{3^i} \left\| [k, \infty) \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{s=1}^N x_{j_s} \right) \right\|_i.$$

For the proof of b) assume to the contrary that there exists a normalized block basis (y_i) of (e_i) whose spreading model $(\tilde{y}_i)$ is equivalent to the unit vector basis of ℓ_1 . Without loss of generality [7] (Proposition 4 in Chapter II Section 2), we can assume that (4) is valid for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$. For $\varepsilon = .01$ choose $i_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and a subsequence of (y_i) which satisfies the conclusion of Lemma 2.3. Choose $N \in \mathbb{N}$ with

$$\frac{2}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{i_0-1} n_i < .01.$$

Since (4) is valid, by Lemma 2.4 there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and a further subsequence (x_i) which satisfies (5). Now let $j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_N$ with $k \leq j_1$ and let $x = (1/N) \sum_{s=1}^N x_{j_s}$. We will first estimate for $i \in \mathbb{N}$ the value of $\|x\|_i$. Choose $E_1 < E_2 < \dots < E_{n_i}$ so that

$$\|x\|_i = \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \|E_j(x)\|.$$

For $j = 1, 2, \dots, n_i$ put $I_j = \{s \leq N : \text{supp}(x_s) \subset E_j\}$ and $I_0 = \{1, 2, \dots, N\} \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{n_i} I_j$ and note that $I_0 = \{s \leq N : \exists j_1, j_2 \leq n_i, j_1 \neq j_2, \text{supp}(x_s) \cap E_{j_t} \neq \emptyset, t = 1, 2\}$, that

$\sum_{j \leq n_i} |I_j| \leq N$, and that $|I_0| \leq \min(N, 2n_i)$. Moreover note that each E_j can only have a non empty intersection with the support of at most two x_s 's, $s \in I_0$. Therefore we deduce

$$(6) \quad \|x\|_i = \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \|E_j(x)\| \leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \left[\sum_{s \in I_j} \|x_s\| + \left\| E_j \left(\sum_{s \in I_0} x_s \right) \right\| \right] \leq 1 + \min(1, \frac{2n_i}{N}).$$

By Lemma 2.4 we have (the second term on the right disappears if $k < i_0$)

$$\begin{aligned} .96 &< \sum_{i=1}^{i_0-1} \frac{1}{3^i} \|[k, \infty)x\|_i + \sum_{i=i_0}^k \frac{1}{3^i} \|[k, \infty)x\|_i \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{i_0-1} \frac{1}{3^i} \|x\|_i + .01 \quad (\text{by (3) since } k \leq j_1) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{i_0-1} \frac{1}{3^i} \frac{2n_i + N}{N} + .01 \quad (\text{by (6)}) \\ &< .01 + .5 + .01 = .52 \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction.

c) Here we need the following result whose proof is again postponed:

Lemma 2.5. *Let (z_i) be a normalized block basis of (e_i) with spreading model $(\tilde{z}_i)$. Then for every $K_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $K_2 > K_1$ and (w_i) , an identically distributed block basis of (z_i) , which has a spreading model $(\tilde{w}_i)$ (which is a block basis of $(\tilde{z}_i)$) such that for all $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$: $.98 \leq \|w_\ell\| \leq 1$ and*

$$(7) \quad \sum_{i=K_1+1}^{K_2} \frac{1}{3^i} \|[K_2, \infty)w_\ell\|_i > .4.$$

Let (z_i) be a normalized block basis of (e_i) having a spreading model $(\tilde{z}_i)$. By passing to a subsequence if necessary we can assume that (1) is satisfied for some sequence (ε_n) which converges to 0. By applying Lemma 2.5 repeatedly there exists an increasing sequence of integers (K_n) , ($K_1 = 0$), and for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists an identically distributed block basis $(w_i^{(n)})_i$ of (z_i) having spreading model $(\tilde{w}_i^{(n)})_i$, which is also a block basis of $(\tilde{z}_i)$, such that for all $n, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$, $.98 \leq \|w_\ell^{(n)}\| \leq 1$ and

$$(8) \quad \sum_{i=K_n+1}^{K_{n+1}} \frac{1}{3^i} \|[K_{n+1}, \infty)w_\ell^{(n)}\|_i > .4$$

Choose a sequence (m_i) of integers such that $(\tilde{w}_{m_i}^{(i)})$ is a block sequence of $(\tilde{z}_i)_i$. We claim that $(\tilde{w}_{m_i}^{(i)})$ is equivalent to the unit vector basis of ℓ_1 . We show that for $(a_i)_{i=1}^N \subseteq \mathbb{R}$,

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^N a_i \tilde{w}_{m_i}^{(i)} \right\| > .4 \sum_{i=1}^N |a_i|.$$

Let $j_1 < j_2 < \dots$ be such that $w_{j_1}^{(1)} < w_{j_2}^{(2)} < \dots < w_{j_N}^{(N)} < w_{j_{N+1}}^{(1)} < w_{j_{N+2}}^{(2)} < \dots < w_{j_{2N}}^{(N)} < w_{j_{2N+1}}^{(1)} < \dots$. Then, since (z_i) satisfies (1), it follows that

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^N a_i \tilde{w}_{m_i}^{(i)} \right\| = \lim_{\ell} \left\| \sum_{n=1}^N a_n w_{j_{(\ell-1)N+n}}^{(n)} \right\|.$$

If we choose ℓ such that $\sum_{n=1}^N w_{j_{(\ell-1)N+n}}^{(n)}$ is supported on $[K_{N+1}, \infty)$ then

$$\begin{aligned} (9) \quad \left\| \sum_{n=1}^N a_n w_{j_{(\ell-1)N+n}}^{(n)} \right\| &\geq \sum_{n=1}^N |a_n| \sum_{i=K_{n+1}}^{K_{n+1}} \frac{1}{3^i} \|[K_{N+1}, \infty) w_{j_{(\ell-1)N+n}}^{(n)}\|_i \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^N |a_n| \sum_{i=K_{n+1}}^{K_{n+1}} \frac{1}{3^i} \|[K_{n+1}, \infty) w_{j_{(\ell-1)N+n}}^{(n)}\|_i \\ &> .4 \sum_{n=1}^N |a_i| \quad (\text{by (8)}). \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Lemma 2.3. Since for all i and j we have $1 \leq \|y_j\|_i \leq n_i$, by a simple compactness and diagonalization argument there exists a subsequence (x_i) of (y_i) such that

$$(10) \quad \left| \|x_i\|_i - \|x_j\|_i \right| \leq 1 \quad \text{for all } i \leq j.$$

Now we claim that

$$(11) \quad \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{3^i} \|x_i\|_i \leq \frac{3}{2}.$$

Indeed, otherwise there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$(12) \quad \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{3^i} \|x_i\|_i > \frac{3}{2}.$$

Choose $j \geq k$ such that x_j is supported on $[k, \infty)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_j\| &\geq \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{3^i} \|[k, \infty) x_j\|_i \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{3^i} \|x_j\|_i \quad (\text{since } x_j \text{ is supported on } [k, \infty)) \\ &\geq \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{3^i} (\|x_i\|_i - 1) \quad (\text{by (10) since } j \geq k) \\ &> \frac{3}{2} - \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{3^i} > 1 \quad (\text{by (12)}) \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. Thus (11) is established. Now choose $i_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$(13) \quad \sum_{i=i_0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{3^i} \|x_i\|_i + \sum_{i=i_0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{3^i} < \varepsilon.$$

Let $k, j_1, \dots, j_N \in \mathbb{N}$ with $i_0 \leq k \leq j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_N$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=i_0}^k \frac{1}{3^i} \left\| [k, \infty) \sum_{s=1}^N x_{j_s} \right\|_i &\leq \sum_{s=1}^N \sum_{i=i_0}^k \frac{1}{3^i} \|x_{j_s}\|_i \\ &\leq \sum_{s=1}^N \sum_{i=i_0}^k \frac{1}{3^i} (\|x_i\|_i + 1) \quad (\text{by (10) since } k \leq j_1) \\ &< N\varepsilon \quad (\text{by (13)}). \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Lemma 2.4. From (4) there exists a subsequence (z_i) of (y_i) such that

$$(14) \quad .98 < \left\| \frac{1}{2N} (z_1 + z_2 + \dots + z_N + z_{j_1} + z_{j_2} + \dots + z_{j_N}) \right\|$$

for all $N < j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_N$. Let K be the maximum element in the support of z_N . Now for $j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_N$ let $u = (z_1 + \dots + z_N)/N$, $v = (z_{j_1} + \dots + z_{j_N})/N$ and $w = (u + v)/2$. By the definition of the norm of X there exists $k' \in \mathbb{N}$, which depends on $j_1, \dots, j_N$, such that

$$\|w\| = \sum_{i=1}^{k'} \frac{1}{3^i} \|[k', \infty)w\|_i.$$

By (14) we have that $.98 < \|w\|$ and thus $k' \leq K$. By the triangle inequality we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} .98 &< \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{k'} \frac{1}{3^i} \|[k', \infty)u\|_i + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{k'} \frac{1}{3^i} \|[k', \infty)v\|_i \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \|u\| + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{k'} \frac{1}{3^i} \|[k', \infty)v\|_i \leq .5 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{k'} \frac{1}{3^i} \|[k', \infty)v\|_i. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$.96 < \sum_{i=1}^{k'} \frac{1}{3^i} \|[k', \infty)v\|_i.$$

Now by Ramsey's theorem [29] (see also [26]) there exists a subsequence (x_i) of (z_{N+i}) and $k \leq K$ such that (5) is valid for all $j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_N$. □

Proof of Lemma 2.5. Let us first note that neither ℓ_p , $p > 1$, nor c_0 are finitely block represented in X . Indeed, if (x_i) for $i = 1, \dots, n_1 + \dots + n_k$ (some $k \in \mathbb{N}$) is a normalized block basis of (e_i) which is 2-equivalent to the first $n_1 + \dots + n_k$ unit basic vectors of ℓ_p for some

$p > 1$, then if $\text{supp } x_1 > k$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} 2(n_1 + \dots + n_k)^{1/p} &\geq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{n_1+\dots+n_k} x_i \right\| \\ &\geq \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{3^i} \sum_{j=n_{i-1}+1}^{n_i} \|x_j\| \quad (\text{by definition of the norm; set } n_0 = 0) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{3^i} n_i \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts (2). Similarly the case $p = \infty$ is excluded and thus the conclusions of Remark 1.2 hold only for $p = 1$.

Let (z_i) be a normalized block sequence in X having a spreading model $(\tilde{z}_i)$, and let $K_1 \in \mathbb{N}$. Choose $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$(15) \quad \frac{2}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{K_1} n_i < .01.$$

By Remark 1.2 there exists an identically distributed block basis (y_i) of (z_i) having spreading model $(\tilde{y}_i)$ which satisfies (4) and $(\tilde{y}_\ell)$ is a block basis of $(\tilde{z}_i)$. Thus by Lemma 2.4 there exists $K_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ and a subsequence (x_i) of (y_i) such that (5) is satisfied for $k = K_2$ and for all $j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_N$. Let

$$w_\ell = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N x_{N(\ell-1)+j} \quad \text{for } \ell \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Since (4) is satisfied, by passing to a subsequence we can assume that $.98 \leq \|w_\ell\| \leq 1$ for all ℓ . Let $(\tilde{w}_i)$ be the spreading model of (w_i) . Then for all $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\tilde{w}_\ell = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \tilde{y}_{N(\ell-1)+j}.$$

Thus $(\tilde{w}_\ell)$ is a block basis of $(\tilde{z}_i)$ and

$$(16) \quad .96 < \sum_{i=1}^{K_2} \frac{1}{3^i} \|[K_2, \infty)w_\ell\|_i.$$

Note also that by with the same argument as in the proof of (6),

$$(17) \quad \sum_{i=1}^{K_1-1} \frac{1}{3^i} \|[K_2, \infty)w_\ell\|_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^{K_1-1} \frac{1}{3^i} \frac{2n_i + N}{N} < .01 + .5 = .51. \quad (\text{by (15)})$$

Now (16) and (17) immediately give (8). □

3. THE SET OF SPREADING MODELS OF X

We recall the standard

Definition 3.1. Let (x_i) and (y_i) be basic sequences and $C \geq 1$. We say that (x_i) C -dominates (y_i) , if $C \|\sum_i a_i x_i\| \geq \|\sum_i a_i y_i\|$ for all $(a_i) \in c_{00}$. We say that (x_i) dominates (y_i) , denoted by $(x_i) \geq (y_i)$, if (x_i) C -dominates (y_i) for some $C \geq 1$. We write $(x_i) > (y_i)$, if $(x_i) \geq (y_i)$ and $(y_i) \not\geq (x_i)$. If $(x_i^n)_i$ (for $n \in \mathbb{N}$) is a sequence of basic sequences and (z_i) is a basic sequence, then we say that (z_i) uniformly dominates the sequences $(x_i^n)_i$ if there exists $C \geq 1$ such that (z_i) C -dominates $(x_i^n)_i$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

The set $SP(X)$ of all spreading models generated by normalized basic sequences in X is partially ordered by domination, provided that we identify equivalent spreading models. $SP_\omega(X)$ denotes the subset of those spreading models generated by weakly null sequences.

Our first result in this section shows that every countable subset of $SP_\omega(X)$ admits an upper bound in $SP_\omega(X)$.

Proposition 3.2. Let $(C_n) \subset (0, \infty)$ such that $\sum C_n^{-1} < \infty$ and for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let $(x_i^n)_i$ be a normalized weakly null sequence in some Banach space X having spreading model $(\tilde{x}_i^n)_i$. Then there exists a seminormalized weakly null basic sequence (y_i) in X with spreading model $(\tilde{y}_i)$ such that $(\tilde{y}_i)$ C_n -dominates $(\tilde{x}_i^n)_i$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Furthermore, if for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $(\tilde{x}_i^n)_i$ is not equivalent to the unit vector basis of ℓ_1 , then $(\tilde{y}_i)$ is not equivalent to the unit vector basis of ℓ_1 . Moreover, if (z_i) is a basic sequence which uniformly dominates $(\tilde{x}_i^n)_i$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then (z_i) dominates $(\tilde{y}_i)$.

In order to prove Proposition 3.2 we need first to generalize the fact that spreading models of normalized weakly null sequences exist and are suppression 1-unconditional.

Lemma 3.3 is actually a special case of a more general situation [17]. The results could also be phrased in terms of countably branching trees of order mn and proved much like the arguments in [20].

Lemma 3.3. Let $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Let $(x_i^{(1)})_i, (x_i^{(2)})_i, \dots, (x_i^{(n)})_i$ be normalized weakly null sequences in a Banach space X . Then there exists a subsequence L of $\mathbb{N}$ so that for all families of integers $(k_j^{(i)})_{i=1, j=1}^{n, m}$ and $(\ell_j^{(i)})_{i=1, j=1}^{n, m}$ in L , with $k_1^{(1)} < k_1^{(2)} < \dots < k_1^{(n)} < k_2^{(1)} < \dots < k_2^{(n)} < \dots < k_m^{(1)} < \dots < k_m^{(n)}$ and $\ell_1^{(1)} < \ell_1^{(2)} < \dots < \ell_1^{(n)} < \ell_2^{(1)} < \dots < \ell_m^{(n)}$, and $(a_i^{(j)})_{i=1, j=1}^{m, n} \subseteq [-1, 1]$ we have

$$\left| \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n a_i^{(j)} x_{\ell_i^{(j)}}^{(j)} \right\| - \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n a_i^{(j)} x_{k_i^{(j)}}^{(j)} \right\| \right| \leq \varepsilon.$$

Proof. This follows easily by Ramsey's theorem. Let $(a_i^{(j)})_{i=1, j=1}^{m, n} \subseteq [-1, 1]$ such that not all the $a_i^{(j)}$'s are 0. Partition $[0, mn]$ into finitely many intervals of length less $\varepsilon/2$. Partition the finite sequences $k_1^{(1)} < k_1^{(2)} < \dots < k_m^{(n)}$ of $\mathbb{N}$ according to which interval $\|\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n a_i^{(j)} x_{k_i^{(j)}}^{(j)}\|$ belongs. Thus by Ramsey's theorem for some infinite subsequence L of $\mathbb{N}$ these expressions belong to the same interval, if $k_i^{(j)} \in L$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$ and $j = 1, \dots, n$. We repeat this for a finite $\varepsilon/4$ -net of $[-1, 1]^{mn}$ endowed with the ℓ_1^{mn} norm. $\square$

Lemma 3.4. Let $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$, $\varepsilon > 0$ and $(x_i^{(1)})_i, \dots, (x_i^{(n)})_i$ be normalized weakly null sequences in a Banach space X . Then there exists a subsequence L of $\mathbb{N}$ so that for all integers in L ,

$k_1^{(1)} < k_1^{(2)} < \dots < k_1^{(n)} < k_2^{(1)} < \dots < k_2^{(n)} < \dots < k_m^{(1)} < \dots < k_m^{(n)}$, the vectors $(y_{k_i^{(j)}}^{(j)})_{i=1, j=1}^{m, n}$ form a suppression $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -unconditional basic sequence.

Proof. By passing to subsequences, if necessary, we may assume that the sequence $(x_i^{(j)})_{j=1, i=1}^{n, \infty}$ satisfies the conclusion of Lemma 3.3 for ε replaced by $\varepsilon/2$ and $L = \mathbb{N}$. Let $\delta = \varepsilon/(2nm)$. For every $j_0 \leq n$, since $(x_i^{(j_0)})_i$ is weakly null we have that for every $i_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $i_1 > i_0$ such that for every functional $f \in X^*$ of norm 1 there exists $i \in [i_0, i_1]$ with $|f(x_i^{(j_0)})| < \delta$. Iterating this procedure we can pass to an infinite subsequence L of $\mathbb{N}$ with the following property: Given $k_1^{(1)} < k_1^{(2)} < \dots < k_1^{(n)} < k_2^{(1)} < \dots < k_m^{(n)}$ in L , $F \subseteq \{k_1^{(1)}, k_1^{(2)}, \dots, k_1^{(n)}, k_2^{(1)}, \dots, k_m^{(n)}\}$, and $f \in X^*$ of norm 1, there exist $\ell_1^{(1)} < \ell_1^{(2)} < \dots < \ell_1^{(n)} < \ell_2^{(1)} < \dots < \ell_m^{(n)}$ in $\mathbb{N}$ with $\ell_i^{(j)} = k_i^{(j)}$ if $k_i^{(j)} \notin F$ and $|f(x_{\ell_i^{(j)}}^{(j)})| < \delta$ if $k_i^{(j)} \in F$. Let $k_1^{(1)} < k_1^{(2)} < \dots < k_1^{(n)} < k_2^{(1)} < \dots < k_m^{(n)}$ in L , $F \subseteq \{k_1^{(1)}, k_1^{(2)}, \dots, k_1^{(n)}, k_2^{(1)}, \dots, k_m^{(n)}\}$, and $(a_i^{(j)})_{i=1, j=1}^{m, n} \subseteq [-1, 1]$ with $\|\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n a_i^{(j)} x_{k_i^{(j)}}^{(j)}\| = 1$. There exists $f \in X^*$ of norm 1 such that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{\{(i,j): k_i^{(j)} \notin F\}} a_i^{(j)} x_{k_i^{(j)}}^{(j)} \right\| &= f\left(\sum_{\{(i,j): k_i^{(j)} \notin F\}} a_i^{(j)} x_{k_i^{(j)}}^{(j)} \right), \text{ and choosing } (\ell_i^{(j)}) \text{ as above,} \\ &\leq f\left(\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n a_i^{(j)} x_{\ell_i^{(j)}}^{(j)} \right) + \delta nm \\ &\leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n a_i^{(j)} x_{\ell_i^{(j)}}^{(j)} \right\| + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \leq (1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} = 1 + \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Proposition 3.2. Using Lemma 3.4, a diagonal argument and relabeling we can assume that for all k the sequences $(x_i^1)_i, \dots, (x_i^k)_i$ satisfy the conclusion of Lemma 3.4 for $m \leq n = k$, $\varepsilon = 1$ provided that $k \leq k_1^{(1)}$. Let $m_1 = 0$ and for $i \in \mathbb{N}$ let $m_{i+1} = m_i + i$. Let $(C_i) \subset (0, \infty)$ such that $\sum C_i^{-1} < \infty$. By passing to subsequences of $(x_i^n)_i$, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we can assume in addition that (y_j) , where

$$y_j = \sum_{i=1}^j 16C_i^{-1} x_{m_j+i}^i \text{ for all } j \in \mathbb{N},$$

is a seminormalized block and has a spreading model $(\tilde{y}_j)$. It is easy to check that (y_j) is weakly null since each $(x_i^n)_{i=1}^\infty$ is weakly null. Let $i_0, m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(a_j)_{j=1}^m \subset \mathbb{R}$. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $m \leq n$ and

$$8 \sum_{j=1}^m |a_j| \sum_{i=n+1}^\infty C_i^{-1} \leq C_{i_0}^{-1} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^m a_j \tilde{x}_j^{i_0} \right\|.$$

Let $k_1 < k_2 < \dots < k_m$ be such that $n < k_1$, and in addition, for $k_1 \leq \ell_1 < \dots < \ell_m$, $\frac{1}{2} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^m a_j x_{\ell_j}^{i_0} \right\| \leq \left\| \sum_{j=1}^m a_j \tilde{x}_j^{i_0} \right\| \leq 2 \left\| \sum_{j=1}^m a_j x_{\ell_j}^{i_0} \right\|$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$, and $\frac{1}{2} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^m a_j y_{k_j} \right\| \leq$

$\|\sum_{j=1}^m a_j \tilde{y}_j\| \leq 2\|\sum_{j=1}^m a_j y_{k_j}\|$. We have from Lemma 3.4 and our inequalities,

$$\begin{aligned}
(18) \quad \left\| \sum_{j=1}^m a_j \tilde{y}_j \right\| &\geq \frac{1}{2} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^m a_j y_{k_j} \right\| \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{i=1}^n a_j 16C_i^{-1} x_{m_{k_j}+i}^i \right\| - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{i=n+1}^{\infty} |a_j| 16C_i^{-1} \\
&\geq \frac{1}{4} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^m a_j 16C_{i_0}^{-1} x_{m_{k_j}+i_0}^{i_0} \right\| - C_{i_0}^{-1} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^m a_j \tilde{x}_j^{i_0} \right\| \\
&\geq \frac{1}{8} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^m a_j 16C_{i_0}^{-1} \tilde{x}_j^{i_0} \right\| - C_{i_0}^{-1} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^m a_j \tilde{x}_j^{i_0} \right\| \\
&= C_{i_0}^{-1} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^m a_j \tilde{x}_j^{i_0} \right\|.
\end{aligned}$$

This proves the first part of the proposition. In order to show the remaining part let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(a_j)_{j=1}^m \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, and note that

$$\begin{aligned}
(19) \quad \left\| \sum_{j=1}^m a_j \tilde{y}_j \right\| &= \lim_{j_1 \rightarrow \infty} \dots \lim_{j_m \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \sum_{s=1}^m a_s y_{j_s} \right\| \\
&= \lim_{j_1 \rightarrow \infty} \dots \lim_{j_m \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \sum_{s=1}^m a_s \sum_{i=1}^{j_s} 16C_i^{-1} x_{m_{j_s}+i}^i \right\| \\
&\leq \lim_{j_1 \rightarrow \infty} \dots \lim_{j_m \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} 16C_i^{-1} \left\| \sum_{s=1}^m a_s x_{m_{j_s}+i}^i \right\| \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} 16C_i^{-1} \left\| \sum_{s=1}^m a_s \tilde{x}_s^i \right\|.
\end{aligned}$$

Now the second part of the claim follows from (18) and (19) □

Remark 3.5. *Using a similar argument we can prove the following:*

- 1) Let $C = \{(\tilde{x}_i^n)_i\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a strictly increasing chain in $SP_{\omega}(X)$. Suppose that $(\tilde{z}_i)_i \in SP_{\omega}(X)$ is an upper bound for C . Then there exists an upper bound $(\tilde{x}_i)_i \in SP_{\omega}(X)$ for C which is not equivalent to $(\tilde{z}_i)_i$.
- 2) If $(\tilde{x}_i^n)_i \in SP_{\omega}(X)$ for $n \leq m \in \mathbb{N}$ then there exists $(\tilde{x}_i)_i \in SP_{\omega}(X)$ which is equivalent to the norm given by

$$\|(a_i)\| = \max_{n \leq m} \left\| \sum_i a_i \tilde{x}_i^n \right\|.$$

An analogous result for asymptotic structure of spaces with a shrinking basis is obtained in [25] (Proposition 5.1).

Proposition 3.6. *Suppose that (x_i) is a normalized weakly null sequence in a Banach space X which has a spreading model $(\tilde{x}_i)$ which is not equivalent to the unit vector basis of ℓ_1 . Assume that 1 belongs to the Krivine set of $(\tilde{x}_i)$. Then for all sequences $(\lambda_n) \subset \mathbb{R}$, with $\lambda_n \nearrow \infty$ and $\lim_n \frac{n}{\lambda_n} = \infty$ there is a block sequence (y_n) of (x_n) having a spreading model $(\tilde{y}_n)$ which satisfies:*

$$\limsup_n \frac{n}{\|\sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{y}_i\|} = \limsup_n \frac{\|\sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{y}_i\|}{\lambda_n} = \infty.$$

Moreover, the set of all spreading models in X generated by weakly null sequences and not equivalent to ℓ_1 has no maximal element (with respect to domination).

Note that the space X constructed in Section 2 is reflexive and satisfies the hypothesis of the proposition (as does every subspace of X).

Proof. Using $\lim_n \frac{n}{\lambda_n} = \infty$, choose a subsequence (n_k) of $\mathbb{N}$ such that $n_k/\lambda_{n_k} \geq 2^{k+1}k$ for all k . Since 1 belongs to the Krivine set of $(\tilde{x}_i)$, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a block sequence $(x_i^n)_i$ of (x_i) which is identically distributed with respect to (x_i) and it has spreading model $(\tilde{x}_i^n)_i$ as given in Remark 1.2 (for $p = 1$ and $\varepsilon = 1$) satisfying

$$\frac{n_k}{2} \leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \tilde{x}_i^k \right\|.$$

Since (x_i) is weakly null and not equivalent to the unit vector basis of ℓ_1 we have that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $(x_i^n)_i$ is weakly null and $(\tilde{x}_i^n)_i$ is not equivalent to the unit vector basis of ℓ_1 . We can also assume without loss of generality that $(x_i^n)_i$ is normalized. Let (y_i) be the sequence which is provided by Proposition 3.2 for $C_k = 2^{-k}$. By the “furthermore” part of Proposition 3.2 we have that $(\tilde{y}_i)$ is not equivalent to the unit vector basis of ℓ_1 thus

$$\limsup_n \frac{n}{\|\sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{y}_i\|} = \infty.$$

Also, by Proposition 3.2 we have that

$$2^k \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{n_k} \tilde{y}_j \right\| \geq \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{n_k} \tilde{x}_j^k \right\| \geq \frac{n_k}{2}.$$

Thus for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\frac{\|\sum_{j=1}^{n_k} \tilde{y}_j\|}{\lambda_{n_k}} \geq \frac{n_k}{2^{k+1}\lambda_{n_k}} \geq k,$$

which shows that

$$\limsup_n \frac{\|\sum_{j=1}^n \tilde{y}_j\|}{\lambda_n} = \infty,$$

and finishes the proof of the first part of Proposition 3.6.

To prove the moreover part, given a spreading model $(\tilde{z}_i) \in SP_\omega(X)$ not equivalent to ℓ_1 use the first part of the Proposition to get $(\tilde{y}_i)$ with

$$\limsup_n \frac{\|\sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{y}_i\|}{\|\sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{z}_i\|} = \infty.$$

Then any spreading model $(\tilde{w}_i)$ which dominates both $(\tilde{z}_i)$ and $(\tilde{y}_i)$ (and exists by Proposition 3.2) is not equivalent to $(\tilde{z}_i)$, which therefore is not maximal. $\square$

In some circumstances we will be able to conclude that $SP_\omega(X)$ admits a transfinite strictly increasing chain. The logical part of the argument is a simple proposition.

Proposition 3.7. *Let X be a separable infinite dimensional Banach space. Let $C \subseteq SP_\omega(X)$ be a non-empty set satisfying the following two conditions:*

- (i) *C does not have a maximal element with respect to domination;*
- (ii) *for every $(\tilde{X}_n) \subseteq C$ there exists $\tilde{X} \in C$ such that $\tilde{X}_n \leq \tilde{X}$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Then for all $\alpha < \omega_1$ there exists $\tilde{X}^\alpha \in C$ such that if $\alpha < \beta < \omega_1$ then $\tilde{X}^\alpha < \tilde{X}^\beta$.

Proof. We use transfinite induction. Suppose that $\tilde{X}^\alpha$ have been constructed for $\alpha < \beta < \omega_1$. Then $\tilde{X}^\beta$ is chosen using (i) if β is a successor ordinal and (ii) if β is a limit ordinal. $\square$

Remark 3.8. (1) *The set $C = SP_\omega(X)$ satisfies condition (ii) by virtue of Proposition 3.2. Hence if $SP_\omega(X)$ does not have a maximal element, then it contains an uncountable increasing chain.*

(2) *Suppose $SP_\omega(X)$ contains $(\tilde{x}_i)$ such that 1 is in the Krivine set of $(\tilde{x}_i)$ but $(\tilde{x}_i)$ is not equivalent to the unit vector basis of ℓ_1 . Let C be the set of all elements of $SP_\omega(X)$ which are not equivalent to the unit vector basis in ℓ_1 . Then it satisfies (ii) by Proposition 3.2 and (i) by Proposition 3.6. Therefore C contains an uncountable increasing chain. Examples of such a space X are the space constructed in Section 2, Gowers-Maurey space GM ([16]) and Schlumprecht's space S ([32]).*

The following result is a strengthening of Proposition 3.6. First recall that if $(x_i)_{i=1}^n$ and $(y_i)_{i=1}^n$ ($n \in \mathbb{N}$) are two basic sequences then the basis-distance between them is defined by

$$d_b((x_i)_{i=1}^n, (y_i)_{i=1}^n) = \sup \left\{ \frac{\|\sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i\|}{\|\sum_{i=1}^n b_i x_i\|} : \|\sum_{i=1}^n a_i y_i\| = \|\sum_{i=1}^n b_i y_i\| = 1 \right\}.$$

Proposition 3.9. *Let (z_i) be a normalized basis and $C < \infty$. Let X be an infinite dimensional Banach space such that the spreading model $(\tilde{x}_i)$ of any normalized weakly null sequence (x_i) in X is C -dominated by (z_i) . Assume also that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a normalized weakly null sequence (x_i^n) in X with spreading model $(\tilde{x}_i^n)_i$ such that $(\tilde{x}_i^n)_{i=1}^n$ C -dominates $(z_i)_{i=1}^n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then for every $\lambda_n \nearrow \infty$ there exists a normalized weakly null sequence (y_i) in X with spreading model $(\tilde{y}_i)$ so that*

$$\liminf_n \frac{d_b((\tilde{y}_i)_{i=1}^n, (z_i)_{i=1}^n)}{\lambda_n} = 0.$$

Proof. Since $\lambda_n \nearrow \infty$, choose a sequence (n_k) of integers such that $k2^k \leq \lambda_{n_k}$ for all k . Apply Proposition 3.2 to obtain a seminormalized weakly null sequence (y_i) in X with a spreading model $(\tilde{y}_i)$ such that $(\tilde{y}_i)$ 2^k -dominates $(\tilde{x}_i^{n_k})$, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. By the moreover part of Proposition 3.2 we also have that there exists $C' < \infty$ such that (z_i) C' -dominates $(\tilde{y}_i)$. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(b_i)_{i=1}^{n_k}$ be a sequence of scalars. Then

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} b_i \tilde{y}_i \right\| \geq 2^{-k} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} b_i \tilde{x}_i^{n_k} \right\| \geq 2^{-k} C^{-1} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} b_i z_i \right\|.$$

Thus for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, if $(a_i)_{i=1}^{n_k}$ and $(b_i)_{i=1}^{n_k}$ are finite sequences of scalars satisfying $\|\sum_{i=1}^{n_k} a_i z_i\| = \|\sum_{i=1}^{n_k} b_i z_i\| = 1$, then

$$\frac{\|\sum_{i=1}^{n_k} a_i \tilde{y}_i\|}{\|\sum_{i=1}^{n_k} b_i \tilde{y}_i\|} \leq \frac{C'}{2^{-k} C^{-1}} = CC' 2^k \leq \frac{\lambda_{n_k}}{k} CC'.$$

Hence $d_b((\tilde{y}_i)_{i=1}^{n_k}, (z_i)_{i=1}^{n_k}) / \lambda_{n_k} \leq k^{-1} CC'$ which tends to zero. The result follows by normalizing (y_i) . $\square$

Propositions 3.6 and 3.9 motivate the following

Question 3.10. *Which normalized subsymmetric bases (y_i) (if any) have the following property: If X is a separable infinite dimensional Banach space so that no spreading model of X is equivalent to (y_i) then there exists $\lambda_n \nearrow \infty$ and a subspace Y of X such that for all spreading models $(\tilde{x}_i)$ of normalized basic sequences in Y ,*

$$\liminf_j \frac{d_b((\tilde{x}_i)_{i=1}^j, (y_i)_{i=1}^j)}{\lambda_j} > 0.$$

This question is a generalization of the following problem raised by H. Rosenthal (which is solved by Proposition 3.6)

Question 3.11. *Let Z be a separable infinite dimensional Banach space so that whenever $(\tilde{x}_i)$ is the spreading model of a normalized basic sequence in Z then*

$$\lim_n \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{x}_i \right\| / n = 0.$$

Does there exist $\lambda_n \nearrow \infty$ such that $\lim_n \lambda_n / n = 0$ and for all spreading models $(\tilde{x}_i)$ of normalized basic sequences in Z

$$\lim_n \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{x}_i \right\| / \lambda_n = 0?$$

The hypothesis on Z is equivalent to: Z is reflexive and no spreading model of Z is isomorphic to ℓ_1 . The question asks whether all spreading models of Z must be uniformly distancing themselves from ℓ_1 for large enough dimensions.

Question 3.11 just asks if one could take (y_i) in Question 3.10 to be the unit vector basis of ℓ_1 . Proposition 3.6 shows that this is not true, even hereditarily.

The version of Question 3.10 for the unit vector basis of c_0 is the following

Question 3.12. *Let Z be a separable infinite dimensional Banach space so that whenever $(\tilde{x}_i)$ is a spreading model of a normalized basic sequence in Z then*

$$\lim_n \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{x}_i \right\| = \infty.$$

Does there exist a sequence (λ_n) with $\lambda_n \nearrow \infty$ such that for all spreading models $(\tilde{x}_i)$ of normalized basic sequence in Z

$$\lim_n \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{x}_i \right\| / \lambda_n = \infty?$$

The hypothesis of this question is equivalent to: no spreading model of Z is isomorphic to c_0 .

We now construct a space Y which answers Question 3.12 in the negative.

First recall the notion of the dyadic tree T and the partial order $\prec$ on it:

$$T = \{(n, i) : n = 0, 1, 2, \dots, 0 \leq i < 2^n\}.$$

We define $(n, i) \prec (m, j)$ if and only if $n < m$ and there exist integers $i = i_0 < i_1 < \dots < i_k = j$ ($k = m - n$) such that $i_1 \in \{2i, 2i + 1\}$, $i_2 \in \{2i_1, 2i_1 + 1\}$, $\dots$, $i_k \in \{2i_{k-1}, 2i_{k-1} + 1\}$. We also write $(n, i) \preceq (m, j)$ if either $(n, i) \prec (m, j)$ or $(n, i) = (m, j)$. A branch of T will be a subset of T of the form $\{(0, 0), (1, i_1), (2, i_2), \dots\}$ with $i_k \in \{2i_{k-1}, 2i_{k-1} + 1\}$ for all k . Let $\mathcal{B}$ denote the set of all branches. We can naturally identify $\mathcal{B}$ with the set of infinite sequences of 0 and 1's. Thus we can also identify $\mathcal{B}$ with the set $\mathcal{B}'$ of finite or infinite sequences of positive integers (the empty sequence of $\mathcal{B}'$ corresponds to $(0, 0, \dots)$; the non-empty sequence $(b_n) \in \mathcal{B}'$ corresponds to the sequence of 0 and 1's where the 1's are located at the positions $b_1, b_1 + b_2, b_1 + b_2 + b_3, \dots$). Every branch $b \in \mathcal{B}$ corresponds in this bijective way to a $b' \in \mathcal{B}'$. For each $b' \in \mathcal{B}'$ (or $b \in \mathcal{B}$) define a sequence $(w_n^{(b')})_n = (w_n^{(b)})_n$ of positive numbers in the following way: If $b' = \emptyset$ then $w_n^{(b')} = 1/n$ for all n . Let $b' = (b'_n) \in \mathcal{B}'$ be a non-empty finite or infinite sequence of positive integers. Set $w_n^{(b')} = 1/b'_1$ for $n = 1, \dots, b'_1$. Assume that $w_i^{(b')}$ has been defined for $i = 1, \dots, b'_1 + \dots + b'_n$ and $w_{b'_1 + \dots + b'_n}^{(b')} = 1/K$ for some $K \in \mathbb{N}$. If $b' = (b'_1, \dots, b'_n)$ then $w_i^{(b')} = 1/(K + i)$ for $i > b'_1 + \dots + b'_n$. Let $b'_1 = (b'_1, \dots, b'_n, b'_{n+1}, \dots)$. If $b'_{n+1} > K$ then $w_i^{(b')} = 1/b'_{n+1}$ for $i = b'_1 + \dots + b'_n + 1, \dots, b'_1 + \dots + b'_{n+1}$. If $b'_{n+1} \leq K$ then $w_i^{(b')} = 1/(K + i)$ for $i = b'_1 + \dots + b'_n + 1, \dots, b'_1 + \dots + b'_{n+1}$. Thus for example if $b' = (2, 3, 2)$ then $w^{(b')} = (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{5}, \frac{1}{6}, \frac{1}{7}, \dots)$.

Note that for every $b' \in \mathcal{B}'$

$$w_n^{(b')} \searrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_n w_n^{(b')} = \infty.$$

Also note that the sequences $(w_n^{(b')})_n$ for $b' \in \mathcal{B}'$ satisfy the following properties

$$(20) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{for every sequence } (\lambda_n) \text{ with } \lim_n \lambda_n = \infty \text{ there exists } b' \in \mathcal{B}' \text{ such that} \\ \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{n=1}^k w_n^{(b')}}{\lambda_k} = 0 \end{array} \right.$$

and

$$(21) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{for all } b' = (b'_n) \in \mathcal{B}' \text{ and for all } m \in \mathbb{N} \text{ there exists } M \in \mathbb{N} \text{ such that} \\ \text{if } \beta' = (\beta'_n) \in \mathcal{B}' \text{ with } \beta'_n = b'_n \text{ for } n = 1, \dots, M, \text{ then} \\ w_m^{(\beta')} \leq w_m^{(b')}. \end{array} \right.$$

In order to see (20) choose $n_1 < n_2 < \dots$ such that

$$\inf_{i \geq n_k} \lambda_i \geq (k + 1)^2 \quad \text{and} \quad n_{k+1} > n_1 + \dots + n_k \quad \text{for } k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Let $b' = (n_1, n_2, \dots) \in \mathcal{B}'$. Then

$$\frac{\sum_{n=1}^k w_n^{(b')}}{\lambda_k} \leq \frac{1}{k} \quad \text{for } k \geq n_1$$

which proves (20). Property (21) is obvious.

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $s_1, \dots, s_n, t_1, \dots, t_n \in T$ such that

- $s_1 \prec s_2 \prec \dots \prec s_n$
- $s_i \preceq t_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$
- $\{t \in T: s_i \preceq t \preceq t_i\} \cap \{t \in T: s_j \preceq t \preceq t_j\} = \emptyset$ for $i \neq j$.
- If $s_i \prec t_i$ for some i then $\{t \in T: s_i \prec t \preceq t_i\} \cap \{t \in T: s_1 \preceq t \preceq s_n\} = \emptyset$.

Then the set

$$\mathcal{S} = \{t \in T: s_1 \preceq t \preceq s_n\} \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^n \{t \in T: s_i \preceq t \preceq t_i\}$$

is called a *bush* and it is denoted by $\text{bush}(s_1, t_1, s_2, t_2, \dots, s_n, t_n)$. For such a bush $\mathcal{S}$ we write $|\mathcal{S}| = n$.

We shall define Y to be the completion of $c_{00}(T)$, the linear space of finitely supported real valued functions on T , under a certain norm given below. For $\alpha \in T$ we let $e_\alpha \in c_{00}(T)$ be defined by $e_\alpha(\gamma) = \delta_{\alpha, \gamma}$. $(e_\alpha)_{\alpha \in T}$ will be a basis for Y in the lexicographic order, i.e. $\{e_{(0,0)}, e_{(1,0)}, e_{(1,1)}, e_{(2,0)}, \dots\}$. $(e_\alpha^*)_{\alpha \in T}$ will denote the biorthogonal functionals of the basis. First, if $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and $\mathcal{S} = \text{bush}(s_1, t_1, \dots, s_n, t_n)$ then we define a seminorm $\|\cdot\|_{k, \mathcal{S}}$ on c_{00} as follows

$$\|x\|_{k, \mathcal{S}} = \sup \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^n w_{k+j}^{(b)} |e_{t_j}^*(x)| : b \in \mathcal{B}, s_n \in b \right\}.$$

For $x \in c_{00}$ we define

$$\|x\| = \|x\|_\infty \vee \sup(\|x\|_{0, \mathcal{S}_1} + \|x\|_{|\mathcal{S}_1|, \mathcal{S}_2} + \dots + \|x\|_{|\mathcal{S}_1| + |\mathcal{S}_2| + \dots + |\mathcal{S}_{n-1}|, \mathcal{S}_n})$$

where the supremum is taken over $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and mutually disjoint bushes $\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2, \dots, \mathcal{S}_n$. Then $(Y, \|\cdot\|)$ is the completion of $(c_{00}(T), \|\cdot\|)$. It is obvious that $(e_t)_{t \in T}$ is a normalized basis for Y . The Banach space Y satisfies the following

Proposition 3.13. a) For every sequence $(\lambda_n)_n$ with $\lim_n \lambda_n = \infty$ there exists a subsequence (x_i) of (e_α) having a spreading model $(\tilde{x}_i)$ such that

$$\lim_n \frac{\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{x}_i \right\|}{\lambda_n} = 0.$$

b) For every normalized block basis (x_i) of (e_α) having a spreading model $(\tilde{x}_i)$ we have that

$$\lim_n \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{x}_i \right\| = \infty.$$

Proof. a) First choose $b' = (b'_n) \in \mathcal{B}'$ so that (20) is satisfied. Recall that b' corresponds to a branch $b = \{u_1 \prec u_2 \prec \dots\} \in \mathcal{B}$ of T . Let $(x_i) = (e_{u_i})$ and let $(w_n^{(b')}) = (w_n^{(b)}) = (w_n)$. We claim that for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$

$$(22) \quad \limsup_{\substack{i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_m \\ i_1 \rightarrow \infty}} \left\| \sum_{k=1}^m x_{i_k} \right\| \leq \sum_{k=1}^m w_k + 1$$

which will finish the proof of a) by passing to a subsequence of (x_i) with a spreading model. By (21) there exists $M \in \mathbb{N}$ such that if $\beta \in \mathcal{B}$ and $u_M \in \beta$ then $w_n^\beta \leq w_n$ for $n = 1, \dots, m$. Let $i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_m$ with $M < i_1$, and set

$$x = \sum_{k=1}^m x_{i_k}.$$

Let $\mathcal{S}_i$, $i = 1, \dots, N$ be disjoint bushes with $\mathcal{S}_i = \text{bush}(s_{n_{i-1}+1}, t_{n_{i-1}+1}, \dots, s_{n_i}, t_{n_i})$ where $0 = n_0 < n_1 < \dots < n_N$ and assume that $\{t_{n_{i-1}+1}, \dots, t_{n_i}\} \cap \{u_{i_1}, \dots, u_{i_m}\} \neq \emptyset$ for all $i = 1, \dots, N$. By the definition of the bush there exists at most one $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ such that $s_{n_i} \preceq u_{i_1}$. Without loss of generality assume that $s_{n_1} \preceq u_{i_1}$. Then $\{t_1, \dots, t_{n_1-1}\} \cap \{u_{i_1}, \dots, u_{i_m}\} = \emptyset$ and

$$(23) \quad \|x\|_{k, \mathcal{S}_i} \leq 1$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. Also for $i = 2, \dots, N$ we have that $u_{i_1} \preceq s_{n_i}$. Thus for $i = 2, \dots, N$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $\beta \in \mathcal{B}$ with $s_{n_i} \in \beta$ such that

$$(24) \quad \|x\|_{k, \mathcal{S}_i} = \sum_{j=1}^{K_i} w_{k+j}^{(\beta)} \leq \sum_{j=1}^{K_i} w_{k+j}^{(b)}$$

where $K_i = |\{t_{n_{i-1}+1}, \dots, t_{n_i}\} \cap \{u_{i_1}, \dots, u_{i_m}\}| \wedge (m - k)$. Combining (23) and (24) we obtain

$$\|x\| \leq 1 + \sum_{k=1}^m w_k^{(b)}$$

which implies (22).

b) Let a normalized block basis (x_i) of (e_α) have a spreading model $(\tilde{x}_i)$. We consider two cases: *Case 1:* Assume that $\|x_i\|_\infty \not\rightarrow 0$. By passing to a subsequence we can assume without loss of generality that there exists a sequence (t_n) in T and $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$|e_{t_n}^*(x_n)| > \varepsilon \quad \text{for all } n.$$

Since (x_n) is a block sequence, we have that $|t_n| \rightarrow \infty$ (where for $t \in T$ we set $|t| = |\{s \in T : (0, 0) \preceq s \preceq t\}|$). Thus it is easy to show that there exists a subsequence (t_{i_n}) of (t_n) and there exists $(s_n) \subset T$ with $s_1 \prec s_2 \prec \dots$ and $s_n \preceq t_{i_n}$ for all n . We can further assume without loss of generality that

$$\{t \in T : s_n \preceq t \preceq t_{i_n}\} \cap \{t \in T : s_m \preceq t \preceq t_{i_m}\} = \emptyset \quad \text{for } n \neq m$$

and for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ if $s_n \prec t_{i_n}$ then

$$\{t \in T : s_n \prec t \preceq t_{i_n}\} \cap b = \emptyset$$

where $b \in \mathcal{B}$ is the branch that contains all the s_i 's. Thus for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_n$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{k=1}^N x_{i_{j_k}} \right\| &\geq \left\| \sum_{k=1}^n x_{i_{j_k}} \right\|_{0, \text{bush}(s_{j_1}, t_{i_{j_1}}, \dots, s_{j_n}, t_{i_{j_n}})} \\ &\geq \sum_{k=1}^n w_k^{(b)} |e_{t_{i_{j_k}}}^*(x_{i_{j_k}})| \geq \sum_{k=1}^n w_k^{(b)} \varepsilon \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Case 2: Assume that $\|x_i\|_\infty \rightarrow 0$. In this case we use the following result whose proof is postponed.

Lemma 3.14. *For all $K \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for all $x \in Y$ with $\|x\| = 1$ and $\|x\|_\infty < \varepsilon$ there exist $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and disjoint bushes, $\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2, \dots, \mathcal{S}_n$ with*

$$.5 < \|x\|_{K, \mathcal{S}_1} + \|x\|_{K+|\mathcal{S}_1|, \mathcal{S}_2} + \dots + \|x\|_{K+|\mathcal{S}_1|+\dots+|\mathcal{S}_{n-1}|, \mathcal{S}_n}.$$

In this case, by Lemma 3.14 we obtain a subsequence (y_i) of (x_i) such that for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ there exist disjoint bushes $\mathcal{S}_1^{(i)}, \dots, \mathcal{S}_{\ell_i}^{(i)}$ such that

$$.5 < \|y_i\|_{K_{i-1}, \mathcal{S}_1^{(i)}} + \dots + \|y_i\|_{K_{i-1}+|\mathcal{S}_1^{(i)}|+\dots+|\mathcal{S}_{\ell_i-1}^{(i)}|, \mathcal{S}_{\ell_i}^{(i)}}$$

where $K_0 = 0$ and $K_{i-1} = |\mathcal{S}_1^{(1)}| + \dots + |\mathcal{S}_{\ell_{i-1}}^{(i-1)}|$ for $i > 1$. Thus for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_n$ we have

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^n y_{j_k} \right\| \geq \sum_{k=1}^n \left(\|y_{j_k}\|_{K_{j_k-1}, \mathcal{S}_1^{(j_k)}} + \dots + \|y_{j_k}\|_{K_{j_k-1}+|\mathcal{S}_1^{(j_k)}|+\dots+|\mathcal{S}_{\ell_{j_k-1}}^{(j_k)}|, \mathcal{S}_{\ell_{j_k}}^{(j_k)}} \right) \geq .5 n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \infty$$

which finishes the proof of Proposition 3.13. $\square$

It only remains to give the

Proof of Lemma 3.14. Choose $\varepsilon > 0$ that satisfies $K\varepsilon < .4$. Then for $x \in Y$ with $\|x\| = 1$ and $\|x\|_\infty < \varepsilon$, let $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_m$ be disjoint bushes with

$$(25) \quad .9 < \|x\|_{0, \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_1} + \|x\|_{|\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_1|, \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_2} + \dots + \|x\|_{|\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_1|+\dots+|\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{m-1}|, \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_m}.$$

Let i_0 be the smallest integer with $|\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_1| + \dots + |\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{i_0}| \geq K$. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{i_0,1}, \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{i_0,2}$ be two disjoint bushes, subsets of $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{i_0}$, with $|\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{i_0,1}| + |\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{i_0,2}| = |\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{i_0}|$ and $|\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_1| + \dots + |\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{i_0-1}| + |\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{i_0,1}| = K$ (if $i_0 = 1$ then $|\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_1| + \dots + |\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{i_0-1}| = 0$). Note that

$$\|x\|_{0, \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_1} + \dots + \|x\|_{|\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_1|+\dots+|\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{i_0-1}|, \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{i_0,1}} \leq (|\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_1| + \dots + |\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{i_0-1}| + |\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{i_0,1}|) \|x\|_\infty \leq K\varepsilon < .4.$$

By (25) and (26) we have that the choice $\mathcal{S}_1 = \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{i_0,2}, \mathcal{S}_2 = \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{i_0+1}, \dots, \mathcal{S}_n = \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_m$ ($n = m - i_0 + 1$) satisfies the statement of Lemma 3.14. $\square$

For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ it is easy to construct a space X for which the cardinality $|SP(X)| = |SP_\omega(X)| = n$. Indeed, $X = (\sum_{i=1}^n \ell_{p_i})_2$ suffices, where the p_i 's are distinct elements of $(1, \infty)$. Also if $2 < p_1 < p_2 < \dots$ then it is not hard to show that $|SP_\omega((\sum_{i=1}^\infty \ell_{p_i})_2)| = \omega$. In this case one obtains an infinite decreasing chain of spreading models.

But we do not know very much what happens hereditarily. Let us mention some questions (among many) concerning the "hereditary structure of spreading models".

Question 3.15. *Does there exist a Banach space such that in every infinite dimensional subspace there exist normalized basic sequences having spreading models equivalent to the unit vector bases of ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 ? If such space exists, must it contain more (perhaps uncountably many) mutually non-equivalent spreading models? More generally, does there exist X so that for all subspaces Y of X and $1 \leq p < \infty$, the unit vector basis of ℓ_p (and of c_0) is equivalent to a spreading model of Y ? Is the space constructed in [27] or [28] such a space?*

In order to answer Question 3.15, the answer to the following question may be useful:

Question 3.16. *Can we always isomorphically (or isometrically) stabilize the set of spreading models by passing to appropriate subspaces? i.e. for every Banach space X does there exists a subspace Y such that for every normalized basic sequence (y_i) in Y having spreading model $(\tilde{y}_i)$ and for every further subspace Z of Y , there exists a normalized basic sequence (z_i) in Z having spreading model $(\tilde{z}_i)$ such that $(\tilde{z}_i)$ is equivalent (respectively, isometric) to $(\tilde{y}_i)$? Is the space X constructed in section 2 a counterexample?*

Question 3.17. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Does there exist a Banach space so that every subspace has exactly n (isomorphically or isometrically) different spreading models? Does there exist a Banach space so that every subspace has exactly countably many (isomorphically or isometrically) different spreading models?*

Many problems exist concerning the structure of the partially ordered set $SP_\omega(X)$ (in the sense of Definition 3.1). We state a few of these. If $SP_\omega(X)$ is countable, then $SP_\omega(X)$ must have an upper bound by Proposition 3.2.

Question 3.18. *What are the realizable isomorphic structures of the partially ordered set $(SP_\omega(X), \leq)$? In particular, for every finite partially ordered set $(P, \leq)$ such that any two elements admit a least upper bound, does there exist X such that $SP_\omega(X)$ is isomorphic to $(P, \leq)$.*

Question 3.19. *Suppose $SP_\omega(X)$ is finite (or even countable). What can be said about X ? Must some spreading model be equivalent to the unit vector basis in c_0 or ℓ_p ($1 \leq p < \infty$)? We address the case $|SP_\omega(X)| = 1$ in Section 4.*

4. SPACES WITH A UNIQUE SPREADING MODEL

Question 4.1. *Let X be an infinite dimensional Banach space so that $|SP(X)| = 1$. Must the unique spreading model of X be equivalent to the unit vector basis of ℓ_p for some $1 \leq p < \infty$, or c_0 ?*

One could also raise similar questions by restricting to either those spreading models generated by normalized weakly null basic sequences or, in the case that X has a basis, to those generated by normalized block bases.

We give some partial answers to these questions using our techniques above.

Proposition 4.2. *Let X be an infinite dimensional Banach space so that all spreading models of normalized basic sequences in X are equivalent.*

- a) *If all the spreading models are uniformly equivalent, i.e. if there exists $D \in \mathbb{R}$ so that the spreading models of all normalized basic sequences in X are D -equivalent, then all spreading models of X are equivalent to the unit vector basis of ℓ_p for some $1 \leq p < \infty$ or c_0 .*
- b) *Let (z_i) be a normalized basic sequence which dominates a (hence every) spreading model of X . Then there exists $C < \infty$ so that (z_i) C -dominates any spreading model of a normalized basic sequence (x_i) in X .*
- c) *If p belongs to the Krivine set of the spreading model $(\tilde{x}_i)$ of some normalized basic sequence (x_i) of X then $(\tilde{x}_i)$ dominates the unit vector basis of ℓ_p .*
- d) *If 1 belongs to the Krivine set of some spreading model in X then all spreading models are equivalent to the unit vector basis of ℓ_1 .*

Proof. If X is not reflexive then there exists a normalized basic sequence (x_n) in X which dominates the summing basis [18]. By [30] (x_n) has a subsequence (x_{n_k}) which is either equivalent to the unit vector basis of ℓ_1 or it is weak-Cauchy. In the later case $(x_{n_{2k+1}} - x_{n_{2k}})_k$ is weakly null and thus by passing to a subsequence we can assume that it has an unconditional spreading model which dominates the summing basis and hence must be equivalent to the unit vector basis of ℓ_1 . Therefore in either case there exists a spreading model in X equivalent to the unit vector basis of ℓ_1 , and it is easy to see that a)–d) hold. Thus for the proof of a)–d) we may assume that X is reflexive.

a) Let $(\tilde{x}_i)$ be a spreading model of X and let p in the Krivine set of $(\tilde{x}_i)$. By Remark 1.2 for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a spreading model $(\tilde{x}_i^{(n)})_i$ of X such that $(\tilde{x}_i^{(n)})_{i=1}^n$ is 2-equivalent to the unit vector basis of ℓ_p^n . Also $(\tilde{x}_i)_{i=1}^n$ is D -equivalent to $(\tilde{x}_i^{(n)})_{i=1}^n$ thus $2D$ -equivalent to the unit vector basis of ℓ_p^n .

b) Let (z_i) be a normalized basic sequence which dominates all spreading models of X . Assume that the statement is false. Then for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a normalized weakly null basic sequence (x_i^n) in X , having spreading model $(\tilde{x}_i^n)$, and there exist scalars $(a_i^n)_i$, such that $\|\sum_i a_i^n \tilde{x}_i^n\| = 2^{2n}$ and $\|\sum_i a_i^n z_i\| = 1$. By Proposition 3.2 there exists a seminormalized weakly null sequence (y_i) in X , having spreading model $(\tilde{y}_i)$ such that $(\tilde{y}_i)$ 2^n -dominates $(\tilde{x}_i^n)$ for all n . Thus $\|\sum_i a_i^n \tilde{y}_i\| \geq 2^{-n} \|\sum_i a_i^n \tilde{x}_i^n\| = 2^n$. Hence (z_i) does not dominate $(\tilde{y}_i)$, which is a contradiction.

c) This follows from b) and Remark 1.2.

d) This follows from c). □

Remark 4.3. If X a basis (e_i) and the hypothesis of Proposition 4.2 is changed to “all spreading models of normalized block bases are equivalent” then one obtains a similar theorem, while the conclusions are restricted to spreading models generated by normalized block bases. The “ X is not reflexive” part of the proof is replaced by “ (e_i) is not shrinking”. If the hypothesis is changed to “all spreading models generated by normalized weakly null basic sequences are equivalent” then one has two cases: Either X is a Schur space, hence X is hereditarily ℓ_1 [30], or X does admit such a spreading model. And the proposition holds in the latter case with the obvious modifications.

A problem closely related to 4.1 has been considered by Ferenczi, Pelczar and Rosendal in [12]: Suppose that X has a basis (e_i) for which every normalized block basis has a subsequence equivalent to (e_i) . Must (e_i) be equivalent to the unit vector basis of c_0 or some ℓ_p ? Using proposition 3.1, the authors obtain results analogous to those in this paper.

Many additional questions remain about the structure of the spreading models of a Banach space X .

5. EXISTENCE OF NON-TRIVIAL OPERATORS ON SUBSPACES OF CERTAIN BANACH SPACES

In this section we give sufficient conditions on a Banach space X for the existence of a subspace Y of X and an operator $T : Y \rightarrow X$ which is not a compact perturbation of a multiple of the inclusion map. This property is related to the long standing open problem of whether there exists a Banach space (of infinite dimension) on which every operator is a compact perturbation of a multiple of the identity. Notice that if a Banach space X contains an unconditional basic sequence then there exists a subspace Y of X and an operator

$T : Y \rightarrow Y$ such that T^n is not a compact perturbation of a multiple of the identity for all positive integers n (Y can be taken to be the closed linear span of the unconditional basic sequence, and T to be the projection on an infinite subsequence). W.T. Gowers [15] proved that there exists a subspace Y of the Gowers-Maurey space GM (as defined in [16]), and an operator $T : Y \rightarrow GM$ which is not a compact perturbation of a multiple of the inclusion. In [2] it is shown that there exists an operator on GM which is not a compact perturbation of a multiple of the identity. It is also known that the asymptotic ℓ_1 Hereditarily Indecomposable (H.I.) space constructed by S.A. Argyros and I. Deliyanni [3] admits such operator (unpublished work of S.A. Argyros and R. Wagner). Certain asymptotic ℓ_1 H.I. spaces constructed by I. Gasparis [13] admit such operators as well [14]. Our approach generalizes the idea of [15].

Theorem 5.1. *Let X be a Banach space. Assume that there exists a normalized weakly null basic sequence (x_i) in X having spreading model $(\tilde{x}_i)$ which is not equivalent to the unit vector basis of ℓ_1 yet 1 belongs to the Krivine set of $(\tilde{x}_i)$. Then there exists a subspace W of X and a continuous linear operator $T : W \rightarrow W$ such that $p(T)$ is not a compact perturbation of a multiple of the identity operator on W , for every non-constant polynomial p .*

The proof uses a convenient auxiliary notation. Let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq [\mathbb{N}]^{<\infty}$ be a family of finite subsets of positive integers. For $(a_i) \in c_{00}$ we set

$$\|(a_i)\|_{\ell_1(\mathcal{F})} = \sup\left\{\sum_{i \in F} |a_i| : F \in \mathcal{F}\right\}.$$

Proof of Theorem 5.1. The main part of the proof is the following

Claim 1: For every $\ell \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ there exists $(w_i^\ell)_i$ a seminormalized sequence in X , an increasing sequence $(M_i^{(\ell+1)})_i$ of positive integers and a sequence $(\delta_i^{(\ell+1)})_i$ of positive numbers with $\sum_i \delta_i^{(\ell+1)} < \infty$, such that $w_1^0, w_1^1, w_2^0, w_1^2, w_2^1, w_3^0, \dots$ is a basic sequence in X , and for every $(a_j^{(\ell)})_{\ell \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}, j \in \mathbb{N}} \in c_{00}((\mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}) \times \mathbb{N})$ we have

$$(26) \quad \max_{1 \leq \ell < \infty} \|(a_j^{(\ell)})_j\|_\ell \leq \left\| \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j^{(\ell)} w_j^\ell \right\| \leq \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \|(a_j^{(\ell)})_j\|_{\ell+1}.$$

Here for $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(a_j)_j \in c_{00}$ we put

$$\|(a_j)_j\|_\ell := \sup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \delta_i^{(\ell)} \|(a_j)_j\|_{\ell_1(\mathcal{G}_i^\ell)}$$

where for $\ell, i \in \mathbb{N}$ we set $\mathcal{G}_i^\ell = \{F \subset \mathbb{N} : |F| \leq M_i^{(\ell)}\}$.

For $\ell = 0$ we consider the left-hand side expression in (26) to be equal to 0, and we adopt the same convention throughout the rest of this section.

Once Claim 1 is established, let $\widetilde{W} = \text{span}\{w_j^\ell : \ell \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}, j \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and define $T : \widetilde{W} \rightarrow \widetilde{W}$ by

$$T(w_j^0) = 0 \text{ and } T(w_j^{\ell+1}) = \frac{1}{2^{\ell+1}} w_j^\ell \text{ for all } \ell \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\} \text{ and } j \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Since $(w_i^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}, i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a basic sequence in X , T is well defined. Let $(a_j^{(\ell)})_{\ell \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}, j \in \mathbb{N}} \in c_{00}((\mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}) \times \mathbb{N})$ and $x = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j^{(\ell)} w_j^{\ell} \in \widetilde{W}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \|Tx\| &= \left\| \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j^{(\ell)} \frac{1}{2^{\ell}} w_j^{\ell-1} \right\| \leq \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^{\ell}} \|(a_j^{(\ell)})_j\|_{\ell} \quad (\text{by (26)}) \\ &\leq \max_{1 \leq \ell < \infty} \|(a_j^{(\ell)})_j\|_{\ell} \\ &\leq \|x\| \quad (\text{by (26)}). \end{aligned}$$

Thus if W denotes the closure of $\widetilde{W}$ then T extends to a bounded operator on W .

Let $p(t) = a_n t^n + a_{n-1} t^{n-1} + \dots + a_1 t + a_0$ be a non-constant polynomial. We show that $p(T)$ is not a compact perturbation of a multiple of the identity operator I on W . Indeed, for any $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and $j \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$T^i w_j^n = T^{i-1} \frac{1}{2^n} w_j^{n-1} = T^{i-2} \frac{1}{2^n} \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} w_j^{n-2} = \dots = \prod_{k=n-i+1}^n \frac{1}{2^k} w_j^{n-i}.$$

Thus for every scalar λ and $j \in \mathbb{N}$ we have:

$$(p(T) - \lambda I)w_j^n = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n a_i T^i - \lambda I \right) w_j^n = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \left(\prod_{k=n-i+1}^n \frac{1}{2^k} \right) w_j^{n-i} + (a_0 - \lambda) w_j^n.$$

Since $w_1^0, w_1^1, w_2^0, w_2^1, w_3^0, w_3^1, \dots$ is a basic sequence in X , there exist $j_1 < j_2 < \dots$ in $\mathbb{N}$ such that $(\sum_{i=1}^n a_i (\prod_{k=n-i+1}^n \frac{1}{2^k}) w_j^{n-i} + (a_0 - \lambda) w_j^n)_j$ is a seminormalized block sequence of $w_1^0, w_1^1, w_2^0, w_2^1, w_3^0, w_3^1, \dots$ which proves that $p(T) - \lambda I$ is not a compact operator.

Claim 1 follows from

Claim 2 There exists a subspace Y of X with a basis and for every $\ell \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ there exists a seminormalized weakly null basic sequence $(u_i^{\ell})_i$ in Y , an increasing sequence $(M_i^{(\ell+1)})_i$ of positive integers, and a sequence $(\delta_i^{(\ell+1)})_i$ of positive numbers with $\sum_i \delta_i^{(\ell+1)} < \infty$, such that the vectors u_i^n for $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and $i \in \mathbb{N}$ are disjointly supported with respect to the basis in Y , and for every $\ell \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and $(a_j^{(m)})_{m \in \{0, 1, \dots, \ell\}, j \in \mathbb{N}} \in c_{00}(\{0, 1, \dots, \ell\} \times \mathbb{N})$ we have that

$$(27) \quad 2 \max_{1 \leq m \leq \ell} \|(a_j^{(m)})_j\|_m \leq \left\| \sum_{m=0}^{\ell} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j^{(m)} u_j^m \right\| \leq (1/2) \sum_{m=0}^{\ell} \|(a_j^{(m)})_j\|_{m+1}.$$

Once Claim 2 is established, passing for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ to a subsequence of $(u_i^n)_i$ and making small perturbations if necessary, we get $(w_i^n)_i$ such that $w_1^0, w_1^1, w_2^0, w_2^1, w_3^0, w_3^1, \dots$ forms a block basis in Y and for all $(a_j^{(\ell)})_{\ell \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}, j \in \mathbb{N}} \in c_{00}((\mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}) \times \mathbb{N})$ we have

$$(28) \quad \frac{1}{2} \left\| \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j^{(\ell)} u_j^{\ell} \right\| \leq \left\| \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j^{(\ell)} w_j^{\ell} \right\| \leq 2 \left\| \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j^{(\ell)} u_j^{\ell} \right\|.$$

Obviously (27) and (28) imply (26) and thus Claim 1 follows.

Now we prove Claim 2. We construct the space Y and inductively on $\ell \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ we construct the sequences $(u_i^{\ell})_i$, $(M_i^{(\ell+1)})_i$ and $(\delta_i^{(\ell+1)})_i$ which satisfy (27). The upper and lower

estimates are based on the following two lemmas of independent interest, whose proofs we postpone until the end of the section.

In their formulation, given an increasing sequence $M_1 < M_2 < \dots$ of integers, we let $\mathcal{G}_n = \{G \subset \mathbb{N} : |G| \leq M_n\}$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Lemma 5.2. *Let X be a Banach space and $(x_i)_i$ be a normalized weakly null basic sequence in X which has a spreading model $(\tilde{x}_i)$ not equivalent to the unit vector basis of ℓ_1 . Then for every $(\delta_n)_{n \geq 2} \subset (0, 1)$ there exists a subsequence (x_{m_i}) of (x_i) , an increasing sequence $M_1 < M_2 < \dots$ of integers, and $\delta_1 > 0$ such that for all $(a_i)_i \in c_{00}$ we have*

$$(29) \quad \left\| \sum a_i x_{m_i} \right\| \leq \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \delta_n \|(a_i)_i\|_{\ell_1(\mathcal{G}_n)}.$$

Lemma 5.3. *Let X be a Banach space and $(z_i)_i$ be a normalized weakly null basic sequence in X which has spreading model $(\tilde{z}_i)_i$ such that 1 belongs to the Krivine set of $(\tilde{z}_i)_i$. There exists a subsequence $(z'_i)_i$ of $(z_i)_i$ with the following property. Given any infinite subset $J \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, any subsequence $(M_n)_n$ of $\mathbb{N}$, and $(\delta_n)_n \subset (0, \infty)$ with $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \delta_n < \infty$, there exists a seminormalized weakly null basic sequence $(y_i)_i$ in the span of $(z'_j)_{j \in J}$ of disjointly supported vectors with respect to $(z'_j)_{j \in J}$ such that for all $(a_i) \in c_{00}$ and all y in the span of $(z'_j)_{j \notin J}$ we have*

$$(30) \quad \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \delta_n \|(a_i)_i\|_{\ell_1(\mathcal{G}_n)} \leq \|y + \sum a_i y_i\|.$$

Furthermore, if $(\tilde{z}_i)$ is not equivalent to the unit vector basis of ℓ_1 then no spreading model of (y_i) is equivalent to the unit vector basis of ℓ_1 .

We now return to the proof of Claim 2.

Since 1 belongs to the Krivine set of $(\tilde{x}_i)$, pass to a subsequence of $(x_i)_i$ constructed in Lemma 5.3. Without confusion denote this subsequence again by $(x_i)_i$, and let Y be its span. Let $K_0, K_1, K_2, \dots \in [\mathbb{N}]$ be disjoint subsequences of positive integers. For all $\ell \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ we will construct $u_i^\ell \in \text{span}\{x_j : j \in K_\ell\}$.

Construction of $(u_i^0)_i$, $(\delta_i^{(1)})_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(M_i^{(1)})_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$: Let $(\delta_i^{(1)})_{i \geq 2} \subset (0, 1)$ such that $\sum_{i \geq 2} \delta_i^{(1)} < \infty$. Since $(\tilde{x}_i)_i$ is a spreading model of $(x_j)_{j \in K_0}$ which is not isomorphic to the unit vector basis of ℓ_1 we may apply Lemma 5.2 to obtain a subsequence (x_{m_i}) of $(x_j)_{j \in K_0}$, an increasing sequence $(M_i^{(1)})_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ of positive integers, and $\delta_1^{(1)} > 0$ such that for all $(a_i) \in c_{00}$ we have

$$(31) \quad \left\| \sum a_i x_{m_i} \right\| \leq \frac{1}{2} \|(a_i)_i\|_1 := \frac{1}{2} \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \delta_n^{(1)} \|(a_i)_i\|_{\ell_1(\mathcal{G}_n^1)}$$

where $\mathcal{G}_n^1 = \{G \subset \mathbb{N} : |G| \leq M_n^{(1)}\}$. This is (27) for $\ell = 0$.

The inductive step - Construction of $(u_i^\ell)_i$, $(\delta_i^{(\ell+1)})_i$ and $(M_i^{(\ell+1)})$: Assume that we have constructed $(u_i^m)_i$, $(M_i^{(m+1)})_i$ and $(\delta_i^{(m+1)})$ for $m = 0, 1, \dots, \ell - 1$ so that (27) is satisfied when ℓ is replaced by $\ell - 1$. Apply Lemma 5.3 for $J = K_\ell$, $(M_i)_i = (M_i^{(\ell)})_i$ and $(\delta_i)_i = (\delta_i^{(\ell)})_i$ to obtain a seminormalized weakly null basic sequence $(u_i^\ell)_i$ in $\text{span}\{x_j : j \in K_\ell\}$ satisfying: for all $(a_i) \in c_{00}$, and $y \in \text{span}\{x_j : j \notin K_\ell\}$ we have that

$$(32) \quad 2 \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \delta_n^{(\ell)} \|(a_i)_i\|_{\ell_1(\mathcal{G}_n^\ell)} \leq \|y + \sum a_i u_i^\ell\|,$$

where $\mathcal{G}_n^\ell = \{G \subset \mathbb{N} : |G| \leq M_n^{(\ell)}\}$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By passing to a subsequence of $(u_i^\ell)_i$ and relabeling we can assume that $(u_i^\ell)_i$ has a spreading model $(\tilde{u}_i^\ell)$. By the “furthermore” part of Lemma 5.3 we have that $(\tilde{u}_i^\ell)$ is not equivalent to the unit vector basis of ℓ_1 . Let $(\delta_i^{(\ell+1)})_{i \geq 2} \subset (0, 1)$ such that $\sum_{i \geq 2} \delta_i^{(\ell+1)} < \infty$. Apply Lemma 5.2 to obtain a subsequence of $(u_i^\ell)_i$ (which we still call $(u_i^\ell)_i$), an increasing sequence $(M_i^{(\ell+1)})_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ of positive integers, and $\delta_1^{(\ell+1)} > 0$ such that for all $(a_i) \in c_{00}$ we have

$$(33) \quad \left\| \sum a_i u_i^\ell \right\| \leq \frac{1}{2} \|(a_i)\|_{\ell+1} := \frac{1}{2} \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \delta_n^{(\ell+1)} \|(a_i)\|_{\ell_1(\mathcal{G}_n^{\ell+1})}$$

where $\mathcal{G}_n^{\ell+1} = \{G \subset \mathbb{N} : |G| \leq M_n^{(\ell+1)}\}$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

We now show that (27) is satisfied. Let $(a_j^{(m)})_{m \in \{0,1,\dots,\ell\}, j \in \mathbb{N}} \in c_{00}(\{0,1,\dots,\ell\} \times \mathbb{N})$. By the triangle inequality and the inductive hypothesis we can estimate $\left\| \sum_{m=0}^\ell \sum_{j=1}^\infty a_j^{(m)} u_j^m \right\|$ as follows:

$$(34) \quad \begin{aligned} 2 \max_{1 \leq m \leq \ell-1} \|(a_j^{(m)})_j\|_m &\leq \left\| \sum_{j=1}^\infty a_j^{(\ell)} u_j^\ell + \sum_{m=0}^{\ell-1} \sum_{j=1}^\infty a_j^{(m)} u_j^m \right\| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=0}^{\ell-1} \|(a_j^{(m)})_j\|_{m+1} + \left\| \sum_{j=1}^\infty a_j^{(\ell)} u_j^\ell \right\| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=0}^{\ell-1} \|(a_j^{(m)})_j\|_{m+1} + \frac{1}{2} \|(a_i^{(\ell)})\|_{\ell+1} \text{ (by (33))} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=0}^\ell \|(a_j^{(m)})_j\|_{m+1}. \end{aligned}$$

By (32) we also have

$$(35) \quad 2 \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \delta_n^{(\ell)} \|(a_i^{(\ell)})\|_{\ell_1(\mathcal{G}_n^\ell)} \leq \left\| \sum_{m=0}^{\ell-1} \sum_{j=1}^\infty a_j^{(m)} u_j^m + \sum_{j=1}^\infty a_j^{(\ell)} u_j^\ell \right\|.$$

Obviously (27) follows immediately from (34) and (35). $\square$

If we are interested only in the construction of an operator on a subspace which is not a compact perturbation of a multiple of the inclusion map, then the spreading model assumptions of Theorem 5.1 can be significantly relaxed and the argument would be essentially simpler.

Theorem 5.4. *Let X be a Banach space. Assume that there exist normalized weakly null basic sequences $(x_i), (z_i)$ in X such that (x_i) has spreading model $(\tilde{x}_i)$ which is not equivalent to the unit vector basis of ℓ_1 , and (z_i) has spreading model $(\tilde{z}_i)$ such that 1 belongs to the Krivine set of $(\tilde{z}_i)$. Then there exists a subspace Y of X and an operator $T : Y \rightarrow X$ which is not a compact perturbation of a multiple of the inclusion map.*

Sketch of proof. Let $(\delta_n)_{n \geq 2} \subset (0, 1)$ such that $\sum_{n=2}^\infty \delta_n < \infty$. Using Lemma 5.2 we obtain a subsequence $(x_{m_i})_i$ of (x_i) , an increasing sequence $M_1 < M_2 < \dots$ of integers and $\delta_1 > 0$

such that for all $(a_i) \in c_{00}$ we have

$$\left\| \sum a_i x_{m_i} \right\| \leq \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \delta_n \|(a_i)_i\|_{\ell_1(\mathcal{G}_n)},$$

where $\mathcal{G}_n = \{G \subset \mathbb{N} : |G| \leq M_n\}$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then by Lemma 5.3 we obtain a seminormalized weakly null basic sequence (y_i) in the span of (z_i) such that for all $(a_i) \in c_{00}$ and $k_1 < k_2 < \dots$ in $\mathbb{N}$,

$$\left\| \sum a_i y_{k_i} \right\| \geq \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \delta_n \|(a_i)_i\|_{\ell_1(\mathcal{G}_n)}.$$

Thus for every $(a_i) \in c_{00}$ we have $\left\| \sum a_i x_{m_i} \right\| \leq \left\| \sum a_i y_i \right\|$, and passing to subsequences if necessary we may also assume that $x_{m_1}, y_1, x_{m_2}, y_2, \dots$ is a (seminormalized weakly null) basic sequence. Thus the operator T defined on $[y_i : i \in \mathbb{N}]$, the closed linear span of (y_i) , by $T(y_i) = x_{m_i}$ for all i , is a continuous operator. Also for any scalar λ the operator $T - \lambda I$ (where I denotes the inclusion operator from $[y_i : i \in \mathbb{N}]$ to X) is non-compact, since $(T - \lambda I)(y_i) = x_{m_i} - \lambda y_i$ which is a seminormalized weakly null sequence. $\square$

We now give the proofs of Lemmas 5.2 and 5.3.

Proof of Lemma 5.2. Since (x_i) is a normalized weakly null sequence, by a slight generalization of a theorem of J. Elton [11] (see [10]), by passing to a subsequence and relabeling we can assume the following. There exists $C > 0$ such that for every $(a_i) \in c_{00}$ with $|a_i| \leq 2$, for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, and for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $F \subseteq \{i : 2^{-n-1} \leq |a_i| < 2^{-n}\}$ we have that

$$(36) \quad \left\| \sum_{i \in F} a_i x_i \right\| \leq C \left\| \sum a_i x_i \right\|.$$

We can also assume that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, if $F \subseteq \{n, n+1, \dots\}$, $|F| \leq n2^n$ and $(a_i) \in c_{00}$ then

$$(37) \quad \left\| \sum_{i \in F} a_i x_i \right\| \leq 2 \left\| \sum_{i \in F} a_i \tilde{x}_i \right\|.$$

Since $(\tilde{x}_i)$ is not equivalent to the unit vector basis of ℓ_1 there exists $\varepsilon_n \searrow 0$ such that for all m we have

$$(38) \quad \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{x}_i \right\| \leq \varepsilon_m m.$$

Let $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\sum_{n \geq n_0} n2^{-n} < 1/8$, $\mathcal{F}_0 = \{F \subseteq \mathbb{N} : |F| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} i2^i\}$, and for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let $\mathcal{F}_n = \{F \subseteq \mathbb{N} : |F| \leq n2^n\}$. Now let $x = \sum a_i x_i$ with $\|x\| = 1$. Let $F_0 = \{i : 2 \geq |a_i| > 2^{-1}\}$ and for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let $F_n = \{i : 2^{-(n+1)} \leq |a_i| < 2^{-n}\}$. We have

$$(39) \quad \begin{aligned} \|x\| &\leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left\| \sum_{i \in F_n} a_i x_i \right\| \\ &= \sum_{\{n : |F_n| > n2^n\}} \left\| \sum_{i \in F_n} a_i x_i \right\| + \sum_{\{n \geq n_0 : |F_n| \leq n2^n\}} \left\| \sum_{i \in F_n} a_i x_i \right\| + \sum_{\{n < n_0 : |F_n| \leq n2^n\}} \left\| \sum_{i \in F_n} a_i x_i \right\|. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that by (36) if $|F_n| \geq n2^n$ then

$$(40) \quad \left\| \sum_{i \in F_n} a_i x_i \right\| \leq C = 2Cn^{-1}2^{-(n+1)}n2^n \leq 2Cn^{-1}\|(a_i)_i\|_{\ell_1(\mathcal{F}_n)}.$$

Let $n \geq n_0$ with $|F_n| \leq n2^n$. Let $x^* \in X^*$ with $\|x^*\| = 1$ such that $\|\sum_{i \in F_n} a_i x_i\| = x^*(\sum_{i \in F_n} a_i x_i)$. Let $F_{n,1} = \{i \in F_n : a_i > 0, x^*(x_i) > 0\}$, $F_{n,2} = \{i \in F_n : a_i > 0, x^*(x_i) < 0\}$, $F_{n,3} = \{i \in F_n : a_i < 0, x^*(x_i) > 0\}$, $F_{n,4} = \{i \in F_n : a_i < 0, x^*(x_i) < 0\}$. There exists $j_n \in \{1, \dots, 4\}$ and $y^* \in \{x^*, -x^*\}$ such that if we set $F'_n = F_{n,j_n}$ we have

$$\|\sum_{i \in F_n} a_i x_i\| \leq 4 \|\sum_{i \in F'_n} a_i x^*(x_i)\| \leq 4 \sum_{i \in F'_n} |a_i| |x^*(x_i)| \leq 4 \cdot 2^{-n} y^*(\sum_{i \in F'_n} x_i) \leq 4 \cdot 2^{-n} \|\sum_{i \in F'_n} x_i\|.$$

Thus if $|F'_n| \leq n$ then $\|\sum_{i \in F_n} a_i x_i\| \leq 4n2^{-n}$. If $|F'_n| > n$ then since $|F'_n| \leq |F_n| \leq n2^n$, by (37) and (38) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\sum_{i \in F_n} a_i x_i\| &\leq 4 \cdot 2^{-n} \|\sum_{i \in F'_n} x_i\| \leq 8 \cdot 2^{-n} \|\sum_{i \in F'_n} \tilde{x}_i\| \\ &\leq 8 \cdot 2^{-n} \varepsilon_n |F_n| \leq 16\varepsilon_n \sum_{i \in F'_n} |a_i| \leq 16\varepsilon_n \|(a_i)\|_{\ell_1(\mathcal{F}_n)}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\{n \geq n_0 : |F_n| \leq n2^n\}} \|\sum_{i \in F_n} a_i x_i\| &\leq \sum_{n \geq n_0} 4n2^{-n} + \sum_{n \geq n_0} 16\varepsilon_n \|(a_i)\|_{\ell_1(\mathcal{F}_n)} \\ (41) \qquad \qquad \qquad &\leq 4 \sum_{n \geq n_0} n2^{-n} + \sum_{\{n \geq n_0\}} 16\varepsilon_n \|(a_i)\|_{\ell_1(\mathcal{F}_n)}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally,

$$(42) \qquad \sum_{\{n < n_0 : |F_n| \leq n2^n\}} \|\sum_{i \in F_n} a_i x_i\| \leq \sum_{\{n < n_0 : |F_n| \leq n2^n\}} \sum_{i \in F_n} |a_i| \leq \|(a_i)\|_{\ell_1(\mathcal{F}_0)}.$$

By (39)-(42) and the choice of n_0 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|x\| &\leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2Cn^{-1} \|(a_i)\|_{\ell_1(\mathcal{F}_n)} + 4 \sum_{n \geq n_0} n2^{-n} + \sum_{n > n_0} 16\varepsilon_n \|(a_i)\|_{\ell_1(\mathcal{F}_n)} + \|(a_i)\|_{\ell_1(\mathcal{F}_0)} \\ &< \frac{1}{2} + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \varepsilon'_n \|(a_i)\|_{\ell_1(\mathcal{F}_n)} \end{aligned}$$

where $\varepsilon'_0 = 1$ and $\varepsilon'_n = \max(2Cn^{-1}, 16\varepsilon_n)$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $\|x\| = 1$ we obtain

$$\|x\| \leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 2\varepsilon'_n \|(a_i)\|_{\ell_1(\mathcal{F}_n)}.$$

Note that if $k_1 < k_2 < \dots$ in $\mathbb{N}$, $M_n = \max\{|F| : F \in \mathcal{F}_n\}$ (for $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$), $\mathcal{G}_0 = \{F \subseteq \mathbb{N} : |F| \leq M_0 + \dots + M_{k_1}\}$, $\mathcal{G}_1 = \{F \subseteq \mathbb{N} : |F| \leq M_{k_1+1} + \dots + M_{k_2}\}, \dots$, $\tilde{\varepsilon}_0 = 2 \max\{\varepsilon'_n : n \in \{0, \dots, k_1\}\}$, $\tilde{\varepsilon}_1 = 2 \max\{\varepsilon'_n : n \in \{k_1 + 1, \dots, k_2\}\}, \dots$, then

$$\|x\| \leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \tilde{\varepsilon}_n \|(a_i)\|_{\ell_1(\mathcal{G}_n)}.$$

Thus, if we choose $k_1 < k_2 < \dots$ such that $2^{n+1}\tilde{\varepsilon}_n \leq \delta_n$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we shall have

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \tilde{\varepsilon}_n \|(a_i)\|_{\ell_1(\mathcal{G}_n)} \leq \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}} 2^{n+1}\tilde{\varepsilon}_n \|(a_i)\|_{\ell_1(\mathcal{G}_n)} \leq \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}} \delta_n \|(a_i)\|_{\ell_1(\mathcal{G}_n)},$$

which finishes the proof of Lemma 5.2. $\square$

Proof of Lemma 5.3. Since 1 belongs to the Krivine set of $(\tilde{z}_i)$, pick for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ vectors $\tilde{w}_j^n \in \text{span}(\tilde{z}_i)$, for $j = 1, 2, \dots$ such that for any subset $E \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ with $|E| = n$, vectors $(\tilde{w}_j^n)_{j \in E}$ are 2 equivalent to the unit vector basis in ℓ_1^n . Moreover, $\tilde{w}_1^n, \tilde{w}_2^n, \dots$ are successive and have the same distribution with respect to $(\tilde{z}_i)$. In particular, denote the common length of their support by K_n .

Fix J , (M_n) and (δ_n) as in the assumptions. Using Schreier unconditionality theorem ([23], also [7] or [26]) pass to a subsequence (z'_i) of (z_i) such that for any finite subset $F \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ such that $|F| \leq nK_n$ and $n < \min F$, for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$(43) \quad \left\| \sum_{i \in F} a_i z'_i \right\| \leq 3 \left\| \sum_i a_i z'_i \right\|,$$

for any scalars (a_i) .

For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let (w_j^n) be equidistributed vectors in the span of $(z'_i)_{i \in J}$ corresponding to $(\tilde{w}_j^n)$, and supported after z'_n , by the definition of a spreading model (1). In particular we may require that for any subset $E \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ with $|E| = n$, the sequence $(\tilde{w}_j^n)_{j \in E}$ is 3 equivalent to the unit vector basis in ℓ_1^n . We may additionally chose the w_j^n 's so that $w_1^1, w_1^2, w_2^1, w_2^3, \dots$ form a block basis with respect to $(z'_i)_{i \in J}$.

For $j=1, 2, \dots$, set

$$y_j = \sum_n \delta_n w_j^{M_n}.$$

We clearly have $\max_n \delta_n \leq \|y_j\| \leq \sum_n \delta_n$, for all j .

To prove (30), pick $(a_i) \in c_{00}$ and a vector y supported outside of J . Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $G \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ with $|G| \leq M_n$. Noting that the supports of w_j^n 's with respect to (z'_i) have cardinality K_n , by Schreier unconditionality (43) we can isolate w_j^n 's from the expression for y_j to get

$$\|y + \sum_j a_j y_j\| \geq (1/3) \left\| \sum_{j \in G} a_j \delta_n w_j^n \right\| \geq (1/9) \delta_n \sum_{j \in G} |a_j|.$$

Taking into account the definition of $\mathcal{G}_n$ and of the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\ell_1(\mathcal{G}_n)}$ this completes the proof. $\square$

It is proved in [2] that the spreading model of the unit vector basis of the Gowers-Maurey space GM as defined in [16], is isometric to the unit vector basis of Schlumprecht space S as defined in [32]. Thus Theorem 5.1 immediately gives the following:

Corollary 5.5. *There exists a subspace Y of GM and an operator $T : Y \rightarrow Y$ such that $p(T)$ is not a compact perturbation of a multiple of the identity, for every non-constant polynomial p .*

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Alspach, S.A. Argyros, *Complexity of weakly null sequences*. Dissertationes Math. (Rozprawy Mat.) 321 (1992), 44.
- [2] G. Androulakis, Th. Schlumprecht, *Strictly singular non-compact operators exist on the space of Gowers-Maurey*, J. London Math. Soc. (2) **64** (2001), 1-20.
- [3] S.A. Argyros, I. Deliyanni, *Examples of asymptotic ℓ_1 Banach spaces*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **349** (1997), no. 3, 973-995.

- [4] S.A. Argyros, V. Felouzis, *Interpolating hereditarily indecomposable Banach spaces* J. Amer. Math. Soc. **13** (2000), no. 2, 243–294
- [5] S.A. Argyros, I. Gasparis, *Unconditional structures of weakly null sequences*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **353** (2001), no. 5, 2019–2058
- [6] S.A. Argyros, S. Mercourakis, A. Tsarpalias, *Convex unconditionality and summability of weakly null sequences*. Israel J. Math. **107** (1998), 157–193.
- [7] B. Beauzamy and J.-T. Lapreste, *Modeles etales des espaces de Banach*, Travaux en Cours, Hermann, Paris, 1984.
- [8] A. Brunel, L. Sucheston, *On B convex Banach spaces*, Math. Systems Th., **7** (1974), 294–299.
- [9] A. Brunel, L. Sucheston, *On J -convexity and some ergodic super properties of Banach spaces*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **204** (1975), 79–90.
- [10] S. Dilworth, N. Kalton, D. Kutzarova, *On the existence of almost greedy bases in Banach spaces*, Studia Math. (to appear).
- [11] J. Elton, *Weakly null normalized sequences in Banach spaces*, Thesis, Yale University, 1978.
- [12] V. Ferenczi, A.M. Pelczar, C. Rosendal, *On a question of Haskell P. Rosenthal*, preprint.
- [13] I. Gasparis, *A continuum of totally incomparable $H.I.$ spaces*, preprint.
- [14] I. Gasparis, *Strictly singular non-compact operators on hereditarily indecomposable Banach spaces*, preprint.
- [15] W.T. Gowers, *A remark about the scalar-plus-compact problem*. Convex geometric analysis (Berkeley, CA, 1996), 111–115, Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ., 34, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1999.
- [16] W.T. Gowers, B. Maurey, *The unconditional basis sequence problem*, Journal A.M.S., **6** (1993), 523–530.
- [17] L. Halbeisen, E. Odell, *On asymptotic models in Banach spaces*, preprint.
- [18] R.C. James, *Bases and reflexivity of Banach spaces*, Ann. of Math. (2), **52** (1950), 518–527.
- [19] H. Knaust, E. Odell, *On c_0 sequences in Banach spaces*, Israel J. Math. **67** (1989), no. 2, 153–169.
- [20] H. Knaust, E. Odell, Th. Schlumprecht, *On asymptotic structure, the Szlenk index and UKK properties in Banach spaces*. Positivity **3** (1999), no. 2, 173–199.
- [21] J.L. Krivine, *Sous-espaces de dimension finie des espaces de Banach réticules*. Ann. of Math. **104** (1976), 1–29.
- [22] H. Lemberg, *Sur un théorème de J.-L. Krivine sur la finie représentation de l_p dans un espace de Banach*. C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math. **292** (1981), no. 14, 669–670.
- [23] B. Maurey, H. Rosenthal, *Normalized weakly null sequences with no unconditional subsequence*, Studia Math., **61** (1977), 77–98.
- [24] V.D. Milman, G. Schechtman, *Asymptotic theory of finite-dimensional normed spaces*. With an appendix by M. Gromov. Lecture Notes in Math., 1200, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1986.
- [25] V.D. Milman, N. Tomczak-Jaegermann *Stabilized asymptotic structures and envelopes in Banach spaces*, Geometric Aspects of Functional Analysis (Israel Seminar 1996–2000), Lecture Notes in Math., 1745, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 2000, 223–237.
- [26] E. Odell, *On Schreier unconditional Sequences*, Contemporary Mathematics, **144**, 1993, 197–201.
- [27] E. Odell, Th. Schlumprecht, *On the richness of the set of p 's in Krivine's theorem*, Geometric Aspects of Functional Analysis (Israel Seminar 1992–1994), 177–198, Oper. Theory Adv. Appl. **77**, Birkhäuser, Basel, 1995.
- [28] E. Odell, Th. Schlumprecht, *A Banach space block finitely universal for monotone bases*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **352** (2000), no. 4, 1859–1888.
- [29] F.P. Ramsey, *On a problem of formal logic*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (2), **30** (1929), 264–286.
- [30] H. Rosenthal, *A characterization of Banach spaces containing ℓ_1* , Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA **71** (1974), 2411–2413.
- [31] H. Rosenthal, *Some remarks concerning unconditional basic sequences*, Longhorn Notes, The University of Texas, Texas Functional Analysis Seminar, 1982–1983, 15–47.
- [32] Th. Schlumprecht, *An arbitrarily distortable Banach space*. Israel J. Math. **76** (1991), no. 1–2, 81–95.
- [33] Th. Schlumprecht *Thoughts on the problem “Identity plus Compact”*, preprint.

Department of Mathematics, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC 29208. giorgis@math.sc.edu
Department of Mathematics, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX 78712. odell@math.utexas.edu
Department of Mathematics, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843. schlump@math.tamu.edu
Department of Mathematical Sciences, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, T6G 2G1, Canada.
nicole@ellpspace.math.ualberta.ca